$E^+$

# The Modern Jew

# The Modern Jew

By

Arnold White

Author of "Problems of a Great City"
"English Democracy," &c.

*"Israel hath cast off the thing that is good;*
*the enemy shall pursue him"*

HOSEA viii. 3

New York
Frederick A. Stokes Company
Publishers
1899

H

Printed by
BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
London

# CONTENTS

# PREFACE

DURING the last ten years I have written on the subject of the Modern Jew for various periodicals—notably in the *Nineteenth Century*, *Contemporary Review*, *Chambers's Journal*, and *North American Review*. With the exception of the Statistics relating to the Russian Jews—for the republication of which I have to thank the Editor of the *Contemporary Review*—the following pages now see the light for the first time.

In the course of my investigations I have received much assistance from friends and others. I desire especially to acknowledge the aid of Major Sharp Hume and of Mr. Randolph L. Hodgson. To the latter's knowledge of Austrian peasant life I am indebted. I also wish to thank Mr. W. Heinemann, my publisher, for his courtesy in kindly seeing the book through the press during my absence abroad beyond the reach of posts.

Careful study of the Dreyfus affair convinces me

that in its main issues it illustrates the decadence of France rather than the phenomena of modern Israel; and I have not, therefore, included any examination of the question in the following pages—the more especially as all unprejudiced people, who agree on the facts, are of one mind. Captain Dreyfus as a hero and a man adds one more to the long line of Jewish worthies whose annals adorn the history of the race.

# INTRODUCTION

AMID the rivalries and quarrels of Europe there is one subject of common interest to the nations of Christendom which threatens to master and mate other questions of international concern. I speak of the waxing power of the Jewish race, their aloofness from the nations among whom they dwell, and the waning patience of the people among whom they settle. Continental antipathy towards the Hebrew race would be of little importance to the British Empire but for the fact that the United Kingdom, with its traditions of freedom and the right of asylum, is marked by destiny as the sanctuary for oppressed Jews flying from political violence or religious persecution in other lands. On former occasions England's open door has admitted the hunted quarry of Continental oppression not only with immunity from evil results, but with advantage to her trade, and with the certainty of enrichment to her national life. Students of English history are unable to place their finger upon a single instance where the practice of the right of asylum has hitherto proved anything but beneficial to the British Empire. Still, the circum-

stances under which the wealth, the power, and the numbers of the Jewish race domiciled in this country are likely to be indefinitely increased seem to call for more prescience and thought at the hands of our rulers than have yet been bestowed upon them.

Anti-Semitism is palpably on the increase. As will be shown in future chapters, there are no grounds for anticipating any diminution in the intensity of repugnance displayed by the populations and rulers of Europe towards Israel in exile. That the Jews principally affected themselves perceive their danger is shown by the fever and force with which the Zionist movement has sprung from nothing to maturity. In France hostility to the Jews has become synonymous with loyalty to the *patrie*, although France was the pioneer of Jewish emancipation. Government after government continues the work of oppression, and at the present time the large tolerance of Napoleon is exchanged for a general display of horror and hatred towards the Hebrew race. In Germany, Hungary, and Austria, where the Jews have acquired by mortgages over the land so fast a grip of national life that nothing but revolution would shake it off, the Jew hatred is as bitter, though expressed in more measured fashion, as in France. In Russia the Government itself organises and executes an anti-Semitic policy, with the result that in the sixteen provinces of the Pale and the ten provinces of Poland, in which the Jews are confined as in a pinfold, seething discontent, over-crowding, organised humiliations, misery, and squalor presage inevitable changes in the near future.

Amid the muttering of popular enmity on the Continent England has pursued her even way. The immigration into this country of the poor of other lands is now almost entirely restricted to persons of the Jewish race. The legislation contemplated by the Marquis of Salisbury when in Opposition has not been brought forward by his Government when in power. Whatever may have been the reasons for the abstention of Lord Salisbury's Government from dealing with the Destitute Alien Question, there is no doubt that their decision was a prudent one, unless they were prepared to deal with the Jewish Question, and to be governed by the facts of the situation. The present immigration of debased and impoverished Jews from the slums of the Russian Ghetto, however undesirable and hurtful to the English people, has not yet attained dimensions sufficient to lift the controversy out of the arena of party strife. When, however, the manifest destiny of the French people, the insurrection of the peasantry and gentry of Central Europe against non-moral capitalist domination, and the bursting of the bonds in the Russian Pale have liberated a torrent of Jews who must fly for safety, it should not be forgotten that England is the one reservoir available for refugees. It is because our rulers and statesmen generally do not appear to have given serious thought to the consequences of the coming invasion that I have attempted to set forth in this book some of the facts of the case. To make the people of England think is the object of this book. If they refuse to think betimes, they will wake up one morning only to discover that they have parted with the realities of national life, and are domi-

nated by cosmopolitan and materialist influences fatal to the existence of the English nation.

Dangers may be predicted from facts which may be unwelcome but cannot be denied. Each immigrant foreign Jew settling in this country joins, not the English community as the Huguenots and Hollander refugees from the Roman Catholic prosecutions of the seventeenth century joined us, but a community proudly separate, racially distinct, and existing preferentially aloof. Members of this community for successive generations, except in rare instances, decline to intermarry with non-Jews, maintain a different Sabbath, consume a different food, and are tied to alien communities of their own race and faith in other lands by closer bonds than any that unite them to the country of their adoption. This Jewish island in the sea of English life is small to-day. Few trades, interests, or classes are so directly affected by it as to create misgiving in the public mind that a danger menacing to national life has begun in our midst, is growing, and must be abated if sinister consequences are to be avoided. There are two methods, and only two, in which the evil results of a Jewish imperium inside the English Empire can be obviated. It can be destroyed and its members expelled as was done in the thirteenth century in most countries in Europe, including England, and is likely to be done over again in France before many years have passed, or the Jewish community, frankly recognising the peril that besets them, must review their conduct and heartily work for instead of against the process of absorption which in two generations made French Protestants of the day of Louis XIV.

an integral part of the English people. So far the enormous majority of them have resolutely declined even to consider methods which they allege would obliterate their racial entity as Jews. Except among the Jewish aristocracy, they refuse to intermarry, and while seeking no proselytes to their own faith, their proudest consciousness lies in the conviction that Jehovah has set them apart among the nations and destines them to a future more glorious and responsible than any that awaits the less gifted and favoured followers of the Nazarene. They have, they say, a mission and a message to the Gentiles.

England, therefore, is in this dilemma: She is either compelled to abandon her secular practice of complacent acceptance of every human being choosing to settle on these shores, or to face the certainty of the Jews becoming stronger, richer, and vastly more numerous; with the corresponding certainty of the press being captured as it has been captured on the Continent, and the national life stifled by the substitution of material aims for those which, however faultily, have formed the unselfish and imperial objects of the Englishmen who have made the Empire. If it be objected that the Jews of the future are no less likely than the Englishmen of the past to govern England well, unselfishly, and with a high ideal for our national life, the answer is simple. Jews are not likely to consider or treat the English with greater tenderness than they have considered and treated their own brethren under dire persecution. When Russia girded up her loins, like Pharaoh, to smite the Children of Israel, and inflicted burdens grievous to be borne upon the

wretched denizens of the poverty stricken Pale, the rich Jews of Europe, with few important exceptions, chose that opportunity to lend Russia the money that enabled her, among other things, to rivet the chains of ascendency on her Jewish subjects. Humanity does not change its spirit in a day, a week, or a century, and we English have no right, therefore, to anticipate that when the Jews arrive at the position in Great Britain which they occupy in France to-day, the conduct of the bulk of them will be more humane, enlightened, or unselfish towards us than it has been towards the French or still more towards their six million co-religionists in the Russian Ghetto.

Those who are only acquainted with the faultless civic and social life of Anglicised Jewish subjects of the Queen are scarcely in a position to judge of the dangers which menace us as a nation, and which menace the English Jews along with the rest of their fellow subjects. In all countries and throughout the centuries, recurrent phenomena attending the protection, equality, popularity, strength, vices, and final ejection of the Jewish community are constant; and seem to form a code of inexorable law which, to be understood, must be examined. The mild spirit of Christian forbearance has promoted the undue economic predominance of a more powerful and intolerant race. When the spirit of Christianity began to wane in France, the religious indifference which followed the Revolution removed the checks to Jewish prosperity, and there, whether by Christian forbearance or religious indifference, no impediment to the aloofness of Israel exists. The intolerance of Christendom towards the Jews is reflected by

an intolerance even deeper and more lasting of Judaism towards non-Jews. They resemble the Roman Catholic Church in this, that until they have obtained freedom and equality they are humbler, more suppliant, and meeker than other men; but when once equality is accorded, the spiritual despotism of Rome herself is not more absolute than the iron intolerance of the prosperous but non-spiritual Jew.

So long as one-half of Europe worships a Jew, and the other half a Jewess; while the engine of international finance is under Jewish control, and while public opinion is medicated by Jewish influence over the European press, the Jews will continue to be in the future, as they have been in the past, the most interesting people in the world. A race that baffled the Pharaohs, foiled Nebuchadnezzar, thwarted Rome, defeated feudalism, circumvented the Romanoffs, baulked the Kaiser, and undermined the Third French Republic presents ample material for legitimate curiosity. Secular exposure to the persecutions of ignorant peoples and a sullen priesthood, Jewish tribulation, and Jewish triumphs alternately compel the attention of mankind. For many centuries the persecution of the Jews assumed a religious form. Christian rulers, at the instance of sacerdotal apprehensions, argued that their own faith was so manifestly the right one, and the creed of Israel so plainly wrong, that it was held to be impossible that any Jew could be sincere in his religious belief. For many generations the Jewish Question assumed this form. Modern liberalism, which is often but a synonym for the decay of faith, has dispelled the fog that enveloped both Jews and Gentiles when Israel

was brought into collision with the Familiars of the Spanish Inquisition. Later on, when the French Revolution had crystallised in men's minds their dormant longings for visible equality, the Jewish Question once more changed. Hebrew prosperity attracted hostility, hitherto directed against the lineal descendants of the murderers of Christ because of the participation of their ancestors in the greatest crime recorded in history.

The virtue of prosperity is temperance; the virtue of adversity is fortitude. Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament, as Bacon reminds us; adversity is the blessing of the New. But the Jew, who through all ages has rivalled the Spartan in fortitude, has never acquired the grace of bearing prosperity with temperance. The virtues of Israel, discovered during long stretches of calamity, bid fair to be forgotten by the nations, in view of the vices exhibited by a few revellers in the boundless prosperity of material success.

Notwithstanding, the Jews are increasing by leaps and bounds, in numbers, in wealth, in sorrows, in calamity, and poverty. If the antipathy of the Middle Ages, inspired by their denial of the Founder of the faith of Christendom, has passed away, it has been succeeded by antagonism partly nourished from the ranks of the Jews themselves. At the end of the nineteenth century the nations are beginning to feel the presence of a new and growing power in their midst. Intellectual superiority, Oriental subtlety, and the training of sorrow accredit the Jews with a complex and mysterious power denied to any other living race. They are found in all nations, but, like the Gulf Stream,

they remain apart from the mass of the ocean around them. They are found in every range of social and intellectual development. The Jew of the Russian Pale differs from the Jew Anglicised for three generations as the Circassian differs from a Spaniard. Although the only true cosmopolitan people in the world, with the exception of the Gitanos, they reflect, like the chameleon, the texture and the tint of the rock on which they rest. They are divided into as many classes as the Christians. Their education, employments, habits, politics, and ideals vary as widely as among the Gentiles. They are too often credited with a general solidarity to which they can lay no claim. Unanimity of view is like one form of crystallisation : it is sometimes the result of pressure. When the pressure of persecution is removed, as in England or America, Jewish unity may be sought for in vain on those subjects upon which the English and American people differ among themselves. Universal agreement on minor matters among a race so quick witted and somewhat quarrelsome is not to be expected. Still, in spite of their differences of opinion, and although scattered over the face of the earth, the Jews maintain a secret and indissoluble bond of common interest. When attacked from outside, Jewry presents a single front to the enemy.

Notwithstanding the solidarity and aloofness of the Jewish race, many of the leading exponents of Israelite opinion constantly deny the existence of a Jewish Question. It is my object in the following pages to describe it.

# I

# WHAT IS A JEW?

# WHAT IS A JEW?

THE term Jew, meaning a descendant of Judah, strictly speaking only applies to the Tribe of Judah. The term is now applicable to all the seed of Israel. In recent years the significance of the word has become modified. Formerly it was employed as a term of contempt, like Whig, Tory, Gueux, Quaker, Sea Beggar, Roundhead, or Jingo. Many Jews, even to-day, are chary in using the name. Israelite is the term they employ by preference. Zionism, and the revival of the national feeling, have restored the term "Jew" to favour, while "Israelite" or "Hebrew" is more rarely employed, except within the confines of the community itself.

But this definition does not answer the question—What is a Jew? He may be of the seed of Abraham, *pur sang*, and yet have adopted English habits and the Christian faith, or, as Huc and Gabet described in their celebrated journey through China to Thibet, half a century ago, "have become Chinese in habit and Confucian in faith, while retaining the racial traits and the physiognomy of their ancestry."

The religious Jew recognises as Jewish no kinship with those who have abandoned the Hebrew faith, and he denies to perverts the proud title of "Jew." To

Israel is committed a mission to the nations and a message to the Gentiles. It is only in fulfilment of this duty that the Semite of Western Asia retains his title to the promises and predictions of the prophecies. Thus the "Froom," or pious Jew.

The average man, however, recognises no essential tie between faith and race, and knows Jewry by its descent rather than its creed. Indeed, the peculiar characteristics usually associated with the Hebrew community are not religious, but racial. The quarrel of un-Christlike Christendom with the Judaism that has broken with Moses is not a question of faith; it is a matter of character and habit engendered partly by Oriental origin and Semitic exclusiveness and partly, perhaps principally, by qualities acquired by the race through centuries of persecution and cruelty at the hands of the followers of the Nazarene under the operation of the first law of Nature—the wish to live.

Still, neither origin, race, nor faith is sufficient to constitute a satisfactory reply to the question—What is a Jew? The Jews of England, for example, may be divided naturally into four classes, each of them separated from the other three by an almost impassable chasm. First, there is the Jewish aristocracy, a type unrepresented in America or in Russia. Patrician Jews differ from their Christian peers mostly by more strenuous and uniform patriotism, by more systematic and larger benevolence, by quickness and by a nimbleness and rapidity of intellect and sensitiveness to public opinion, which is not a common characteristic of nobles of recent creation. In the princely homes of the Jewish aristocracy the most brilliant society

assembles. Invitations to the great Jewish houses are openly sought; to be included in their circle of friends is in itself a *cachet;* exclusion or expulsion is a social calamity. There is one feature, however, in the society encountered in Jewish palaces—one never meets a Jew unless it be an aristocrat. The connection maintained between the Hebrew patrician and his co-religionists of the *bourgeoisie* is either official or philanthropic. The tastes of the Jews who have risen are as frankly Greek as the rest of the world, while their appreciation of the beautiful and their repugnance to things unbeautiful are equal. Neither Plato nor Goethe has anything to teach them.

Of the Jewish aristocrat I do not speak in this book. The advantages reaped by England from the Hebrew aristocracy, not only material, but intellectual and artistic, require no comment. They are notorious. It is the presence of this class which has done most to prevent the outbreak of anti-Semitism in England, to allay impatience and postpone action to restrict the ever-increasing horde of undesirable foreigners who are pouring into this country. In America the Jew is openly despised and laughed at. He is caricatured in the comic papers, excluded from society, and is accumulating trouble. The difference between the English and the American treatment of the Hebrew community is almost entirely due to the absence of a wise and capable Jewish aristocracy in America, as devotedly attached to the great Republic as the great Jewish houses of England are attached to their Queen and country. It should not be forgotten that the identification of the Jewish aristocracy with English history has been

consolidated, if not accomplished, by their readiness to intermarry with Christians—thereby setting an example to their co-religionists which is not yet followed.

The second class into which the modern Jew naturally falls differs little from the patricians except in their resolute refusal to permit their daughters to intermarry with Englishmen. The pride of race, the teachings of the Talmud, and the consciousness of consecration to the mission with which they have been entrusted combine to maintain, in highly educated religious Jews, the aloofness which is at the root of everything to which the nations of Christendom can legitimately object. To this class of Jews belongs the highly educated and anglicised Hebrew, who has practically relinquished his faith without abandoning the racial characteristics of which I shall speak later on. The professions are thronged with this class, and their contributions to our national life are of great value and not to be spared without inflicting heavy loss on the national welfare and on British institutions. The good anglicised Jew springs from three or four generations settled in England, and is as proud of the traditions of Trafalgar or of the sovereignty of Shakespeare as any of the legitimate descendants of the people whose names are written in the Domesday Book. The whole of the class of which I am speaking are not only notoriously better citizens than the average Englishmen, but they are sedulous in the fulfilment of their duties to their poor co-religionists. These are they whose names are found on the innumerable committees and in the mangement of beneficent societies which have rendered Jewish charity in England one of the few unchallenged

triumphs of modern civilisation. With the single exception of the general refusal to intermarry with their fellow subjects outside the Jewish community, thus tending to maintain Israel as a caste apart from other Englishmen, there is nothing to distinguish them from the rest of their fellow subjects.

The third class of Jews resident in England is less easy to describe. I sincerely wish to avoid wounding the feelings of any one, but in the concentrated and relentless pursuit of material gain, in the profession and practice of an ignoble cosmopolitanism, in the avoidance of patriotic and even of communal duties, is to be found the raw material of revolutionary outbreak. These are the Jews who leave to a comparatively small class of their co-religionists the duty of grappling with the almost overwhelming difficulties of providing for their own poor and a constant influx of immigrants—a situation that must become worse before it is better.* Jews of the Sephardim are rarely found in this class. They are very largely recruited from the Aschkenasim.† The personal habits of these cosmopo-

* ANGLO-JEWISH ASSOCIATION.—With reference to Mr. I. L. Bril's letter on the Anglo-Jewish Association, in our last week's issue, we are requested by Mr. B. Kisch to state that by "Jews of Foreign extraction who ought to subscribe but do not," he meant not the poor immigrants at the East End, whose subscriptions would have to be collected in weekly pence, but the well-to-do, and, in many cases, wealthy Jews, residing mostly in the north and north-west of London, who evade their fair share of communal burdens. There is probably no one concerned with the work of any of our charities who is not aware of the existence of a large number of persons of the class referred to.—*Jewish Chronicle*, January 27, 1899.

† A term applied to the Jews of German-speaking and Slavonic countries as distinguished from the Spanish and Portuguese Jews.

lites now involve their exclusion from many clubs, and arouse an unpopularity which is blindly and unjustly visited upon the whole Jewish community. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these unlovable people, and it is sufficient to say that it is against them that the growing repugnance to prosperous Jews is mainly due. Successful foreigners who have renounced Germany without embracing England cannot expect popularity even if their manners were charming and their methods of life such as to cause admiration and inspire respect. This class of Jew, however, seems to be impregnable to those considerations which require a certain minimum of refinement on the part of every one who undertakes to mix with his fellow men. As a rule these foreign Jews are well-to-do. They deny themselves nothing. They spend freely the gains which they have acquired by superior sharpness over the native born. The descendants of those who rolled back the invasion of Sennacherib from the walls of Jerusalem fill the stalls of every fashionable theatre, occupy the best rooms at the best hotels, indulge in every pastime and are present at every spectacle that can add to their pleasure and enhance their joy in the material side of life. This is the class which is the cause of coming danger; and the peril arises, not from their enjoyment of life, nor from their capture of the good things that are going, but from their hide-bound refusal to discharge the responsibilities as well as accept the privileges of money-making. In times of public turmoil, should they arise, this is the class that will be weighed in the balance and found wanting.

The fourth class of Jew in this country is the Destitute Alien. To him I devote a chapter by himself.

# II

# THE PROBLEM IN RUSSIA

# THE PROBLEM IN RUSSIA

## I

## THE CASE FOR THE RUSSIAN JEW

BEFORE the recent outbreak of anti-Semitism in France the serious character of the Jewish Question in Russia was known to those who closely watched the phases of its development. To the predecessors and colleagues of M. Pobedonosteff the problem is insoluble. The administration is on the horns of a dilemma. The extermination of millions of Jews, whether by massacre or pestilence, is impracticable on the verge of the twentieth century, while the destruction of the Russian State, in the opinion of patriot Slavs, would be the direct and sinister consequence of Jewish emancipation, and is equally out of the region of practical politics. From this *impasse* there is no escape visible to the *Tchinovnik*. In the course of inquiries in the year 1897 I met with fourteen instances of alleged ill-treatment of the Jews in Russia. In two cases of spoliation and brutality that occurred at Schpola and at Kantakonzene, in the Government of Kherson, the evidence obtainable by me was corroborated by separate, secret, and independent inquiry. The fourteen

instances of ill-treatment which became known to me were but typical of thousands of cruel acts of tyranny of which no human being outside Russia is likely to hear. According to the Minister of the Interior, M. Goremykine, the authenticated evidence of cruelty and pillage inflicted on certain Jews, which I placed before him, was neither to be denied nor excused. The trouble arose from the delay in the arrival of troops. Orthodox peasants, infuriated with the rapacity of individuals, had attacked the whole Jewish community. Since it is impossible to garrison every village with the force of soldiers required for the restoration of order in the incessant quarrels between the Jews and the peasantry, troops have to be obtained from the great towns. Railway communication is scanty, and hence regrettable delay constantly arises before order is re-established. Thus the Minister explains the sporadic outbreaks which make Jewish existence in Russia a tragedy.

One of the saddest features of the situation in Russian Jewry is the moral and physical degeneration of its inhabitants. Nearly two thousand years of slum life have modified the original characteristics of the majority of the race. I have seen specimens of Hebrew agriculturists in the colonies established by the Emperor Nicholas who would have done credit to any race in Europe. If the Jew be essentially parasitic in character and habits; if he can only live by exploiting the vices or preying on the weaknesses of others; to whom existence is impossible when forced to face life as other men face it, with the strength of his own right arm; to whom the sweetest

of music is the rustling of bank notes and the chinking of coin; then the conclusion is irresistible that the Jew is not only a bad Russian citizen, but that the race is disqualified from settlement among civilised communities on any portion of the earth's surface. There is no escape from the logic of this position. If the indictments brought against the Chosen People by Madame de Novikoff and M. Drumont can be sustained by sound evidence, then the more rapidly that French and Russian methods are adopted by Christendom and make an end of Israel the better for the non-Jewish inhabitants of the planet. Moreover, it is manifestly unfair to Russia and to France for England and America to leave to them the solitary responsibility for action. If there be grave reason to believe that Russia will be devoured by a locust swarm of non-moral and mercenary Hebrews, it is high time for other nations to smite the Chosen People hip and thigh and to join Holy Russia in her artless effort to revenge the tragedy at Calvary, and maintain the Slav ideals in their purity. On the other hand, it is equally clear that if Russian methods of dealing with the Jewish Question are fatal to economics and to morals, then the Russian persecution of the Jews is only to be characterised, in the language of Mr. Lecky, as "that most hideous story of our century."

Is there, however, any solid foundation for the belief that the Jews are merely parasites; that except as middleman, money-lenders, and higglers of the market they cannot exist? The allegation is universal throughout Russia, and, for the present, the French mob is of the same opinion. But is it true? There is doubtless

a good deal to be said for the charge as it stands; on the other hand, a suppression of the material facts that tell against it is essential before it can be sustained. Is it true that international finance has fallen captive to Jewish energy and skill? In London, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin the Jew banker is easily first among the merchants in money. In England the fall of the Barings has given a lonely supremacy to a Jewish banking-house with princely traditions. But money trading is not the only walk of life in which the Jew has been found to take the highest place. Wherever material comfort and personal safety are obtainable, there are nimble brain, deft finger, and sensitive organisation found on the topmost rung of the ladder. Medicine, music, law, surgery, politics, journalism, and art are being progressively officered by men of the Jewish race. The intellectual pre-eminence of the Jew is not to be regretted by the Anglo-Saxon race, itself built up from materials thrown out by other nations. Stupid and self-indulgent people who are passed in the race of life by earnest and clever men, whether Jew or Gentile, naturally join the ranks of the anti-Semites; but there is another class of Jew-hater, who is not so much concerned with the alleged parasitism of the Jew as with the mental and spiritual effects of the worship of the modern equivalent of the Golden Calf. It can scarcely be denied by the warmest advocates of equality and freedom for all, even among the more enlightened Jews themselves, that from modern Israel a river of materialism emerges. Russian statesmen perceive that the decay of faith in England, France, and Central Europe leaves the ground open for the operation of a

new social morality. They dread the modern democracy, acknowledging neither God nor master, that has ceased to hold in reverence the ideals its fathers worshipped, and they attribute to Jewish materialism a large responsibility for the evil. In Western Europe all things are in the crucible. The decay of faith has raised the desire for physical comfort to the highest place, and while destroying the motive for resignation in trouble, it has replaced belief in either religion or duty by a sense of injustice to those who enjoy the good things of this life. Democracy, sitting at the feet of the Hebrew Marx and Lasalle, intends to take its share of the banquet of life whoever may want. It is against these waves of materialism that the pasteboard rock of Russian orthodoxy presents so firm a front. Russia is honest in this matter. Men like M. Pobedonosteff hold the doctrine that it is better for dissenters from orthodoxy to lose a limb or an eye than to enter whole into hell fire. Russia does not affect to love the Jew. She believes him to be to-day as he was in the time of Moses—the ardent worshipper of the Golden Calf. By safe-guarding the promotion and careers of her orthodox officials, who are compelled to take the communion at stated intervals, she preserves Russia for the Slav, and chastens the Jew for his soul's good, as the Dominican Torquemada smote and racked Hebrew rebels to the Church in the time of Philip. Russia considers the Jew's faith an insult to her own, his presence a menace to her unity, and his ideal of a chosen people with a message to the nation an outrage upon her national life.

Although the statistics I am about to give of the

actual position of the Jewish people in Russia are taken from official sources, they have never, so far as I know, been available to the English or the Russian public. I am indebted to the researches of MM. Oulenikoff and Soubotin for the opportunity of setting forth in a concise form the existing economic and vital effects of the Jews in Russia on the general population of the Empire.

The following table, compiled not from Jewish but from official sources, shows the relative condition of the population in the fifteen provinces constituting the Pale of Settlement, the twelve provinces adjacent to the Pale, the twenty-three remaining provinces, and the whole of Russia, respectively:

| | FIFTEEN JEWISH PROVINCES. THE PALE. | TWELVE ADJACENT PROVINCES. | TWENTY-THREE OTHER PROVINCES. | ALL RUSSIA. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The annual mortality per 1000 inhabitants for the period 1867–1885. | 36.6 | 40.3 | 41.1 | No returns. |
| Annual increase of population 1867–1883. | 1.72 p.c. | 1.47 p.c. | No returns | 1.28 p.c. |
| Arrears of land tax from peasant proprietors in 1882, the last year of official returns. | 11.7 p.c. | 26.6 p.c. | 44.3 p.c. | 27 p.c. |
| Number of cattle per 1000 dessiatines* of arable land 1883 (no later returns published). | 639 | 480 | 541 | 539 |

* The dessiatine equals 2.69972 English acres.

| | FIFTEEN JEWISH PROVINCES. THE PALE. | TWELVE ADJACENT PROVINCES. | TWENTY-THREE OTHER PROVINCES. | ALL RUSSIA. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Increase of horses in 14 years, 1874–1888. | 116 p.c. | 11 p.c. | 6 p.c. | 27 p.c. |
| Ditto cattle. | 26 p.c. | 11 p.c. | 17 p.c. | 19 p.c. |
| Capital owned by village communities per 1000 peasants, 1887. | 681 roubles | 403 roubles | No returns | 521 roubles |
| Consumption of alcohol per 100 inhabitants, 1888. | 30.6 vedro* | 27.7 vedro | 27.2 vedro | 28.0 vedro |
| Deaths from drunkenness in 1887, per 1,000,000 inhabitants. | 12.0 | 61.0 | 77.0 | 50.0 |
| Houses of ill-fame, per 100,000 of town population. | 57.0 | 109.0 | 80.0 | 77.0 |
| Incendiary fires (per 1000 fires) for 1883–1887. | 7.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Commercial licences per 1000 inhabitants, 1887. | 9.5 | 10.2 | 17.3 | — |

* The vedro equals 2.707 imperial gallons.

## SPACE

Jews may inhabit . . . . . 912,000 square versts, or 19 per cent.

Jews are forbidden to trespass on . . 3,858,000 square versts, or 81 per cent.

(Not including Siberia, the Caucasus, and Asia Minor.)

The number of agricultural Jews is . 64,000.

## COMMERCE

In the Jewish Pale, or the fifteen provinces

| | |
|---|---|
| The number of Jewish merchants was in 1886 . . . . . | 11,468 or 55 per cent. |
| The capital employed by Jewish merchants was in 1886 . . . . | 437,000,000 roubles, or 47.1 per cent. |
| Average turnover per Jewish merchant . | 38,000 roubles. |
| Average turnover per Gentile merchant. | 53,600 roubles. |
| Number of Jewish traders per 10,000 Jews . . . . . | 34.1. |
| Number of Gentile traders per 10,000 Gentiles (excluding peasants) . . | 18.8 |
| Jewish retail traders in 1884 . . . | 60,729 or 67 per cent. |
| In the hands of the Jews in 1886— | |
| brandy distilleries . . . . | 2.5 per 1000 or 55 per cent. |
| brandy stores . . . . . | 1.8 „ „ 89 „ |
| „ retail establishments. | 37.7. |
| Number of Jew manufactories in 1886 . | 1460 or 31 per cent. |
| Value of their manufactures in 1886 . | 47,300,000 roubles, or 16 per cent. |
| Average value of products per Jew manufactories . . . . . | 32,000 roubles. |
| Annual value of products per Gentile manufactories . . . . . | 78,000 roubles. |
| Number of Jew artisans, 1886 . . | 293,000. |
| Land leased by Jews, 1885 . . . | 1,993,000 dessiatines, or 4.14 per cent. |

## CRIMINAL STATISTICS

In all Russia, the average number of Jews and non-Jews convicted of crime for the period 1875–85, per annum, was as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Jews (per 100,000 Jews) . . . . | 259. |
| Non-Jews (per 100,000 non-Jews) . . | 426. |
| The proportion of Jews convicted of political crime was, for the years 1881–1885 . . . . . | 13 per cent. of the whole. |
| And for 1886–1887 . . . . . | 14 per cent. of the whole. |

Those who will take the trouble to examine the foregoing statistics will discover that the popular notion of the evil effect of Jewish influence is not supported by facts. It must be borne in mind that the figures given are taken only from official sources. It is true that the Government has ceased to publish the statistics, but I can only assume that it has done so because the evidence they contained is so palpably in favour of the Jews that the official embitterment of their lives acquires no justification from the real facts of the case.

Seeing that the Russian Empire comprises one-seventh of the land surface of the globe, stretches from Germany to the Pacific, and covers an area of nearly nine million square miles, the exclusion of the Jews from the higher ranks of the Administration, notwithstanding their admitted abilities, is the most extravagant compliment ever paid by one race to another. With the tremendous task undertaken by the Tsar and his Ministers of Russifying Asia, and in the absence of an educated middle class of the population, it is difficult to understand from what source Russia is to draw administrative material for the biggest job ever undertaken by a dreamy and inaccurate people if she excludes the ablest in the land. No Jew is allowed to enter Siberia. Jews may not settle at Port Arthur. It is incredible that, in a backward and undeveloped country like Russia, the presence of one Jew in eight hundred of the population would prove dangerous to the State.

The cry against the Russian Jews that they are not agriculturists is equivalent to charging a man with

inability to swim when he is forcibly prevented during the whole of his life from entering the water. Under Russian law a Jew may not farm or become a miller or a fisherman; he may not buy, sell, lease or rent land; but the Jews of Galicia, the Jews of the Nicholas colonies in South Russia, and the Jews of Bohemia are found to be good farmers and many of them good landowners. Severed from the soil and estranged from the plough, the present generation of students of the Talmud have naturally become incapable of bearing the physical strain of agricultural life. Sunshine and sweat for one generation would restore the traditions of the time when Israel was both a pastoral and an agricultural people. No conditions of life sweeten and purify human beings so much as hard work on the soil under the blue sky. The truth of this proposition exists in Russia itself. The physical change to be remarked in the second and third generations of the handful of Jews who were planted on the soil by Tsar Alexander I. is most remarkable. When they first reached the site of the colonies they were physically weak, exhausted by exertion and travel, and ignorant of agriculture. They died like flies. According to Prince Demidoff San Donato: "The position of the first Jewish settlers, who belonged chiefly to the most destitute members of the Jewish communities, was most deplorable." In 1810 so great was the mortality that the experiments were dropped. In 1834 they were resumed, and in 1846 the Emperor Nicholas extended them still further.

I have visited these colonies and have conversed with the old and young. They told me of the hardships

they had to encounter—greater even than those usually attendant on the initial stages of colonisation.

The administration was composed of retired military men who, for the most part, were more occupied with their own interest than with the development of the prosperity of the colonies. The houses, such as they were, being built of green bricks, collapsed in the first rains, and they were erected so far from water that many of them were never occupied. The agricultural implements were worthless. The discipline imposed on these luckless farmers was of the utmost severity. The idle were flogged or imprisoned, and many were sent to Siberia for lack of enthusiasm in their work. Irksome administrative rules checked the development of the colonies, and, while they increased the distaste of those already engaged in cultivating the soil, deterred others from pursuing a similar career. In the archives of the Bessarabian Board of Administration, kept at Cherson, it is stated in an official document that the hovels prepared for the poor Jews from Mariapol and Berdicheff were built of frozen materials during severe frost by half-frozen workmen. Before they were occupied, many of them fell to pieces, and instead of habitations the Jews only found ruins. With the irony prevalent in these regions, the Provincial Board accused the immigrants of not keeping their tenements in good repair! Cold, damp, and lack of proper food brought on scurvy, and many died a miserable death. Medical attendance they had none, and a more direful lot than fell to these Jewish settlers was not borne even by the English settlers sent by Lord Liverpool in 1820 to the Cape Colony.

These Jewish settlers have succeeded well. They are tanned with the sun, are good riders, sober, industrious agriculturists, and as fitted to be their country's pride as any peasantry in Europe.

The following are recent testimonials of responsible Russian proprietors and others to the agricultural capacity of the Russian Jews which I obtained during my visit to the colonies in question.

(1) Living continuously for twenty-three years on my property near the village of Sergnewka, in the district of Cherson, at a distance of three versts from the Jewish colony of Romanowka, I can with truth certify that the Jews of that colony occupy themselves personally with the cultivation of the ground and the rearing of cattle.

They also engage themselves for harvest work to the farmers round. In a word, they occupy themselves in the same way as do the farmers who hire them.—(*Signed*) Proprietaire, gentleman, CHRISANOPHE ALEKSANDROWICH PETROWSKI; Proprietaire, GOUSTAW HENRI CHOWIEZ FALTZ.

(2) Living on my estate in the district of Cherson for twenty-five years, close to the Jewish colony of Novopoltawka, I can testify that for all this time I have been content with their conduct as neighbours, and that there has never been a quarrel or misunderstanding between us. I can also testify that the majority of the inhabitants of this colony occupy themselves personally with agriculture, and have procured of late years the best machinery for agricultural purposes, for which they have also plenty of horses and cattle.—(*Signed*) Proprietaire, honorary citizen, PETRE PETROWIEZ ZURITZIN.

(3) February 18, 1892.—I certify that my neighbours, the Jewish colonists of Novopoltawka, grow successfully different kinds of corn, as well as carry on all the usual occupations of an agricultural life, as for example, gardening, rearing of cattle,

horses, &c.—(*Signed*) Proprietaire, in the district of Cherson, NICOLAS PAWLOFF LOUGOWSKI.

(4) Living on my property in the district of Cherson for twenty-five years, I have had occasion to observe closely the Jewish colonies of Novopoltawka, and I can declare that they occupy themselves really with agriculture, doing the hardest work themselves. Some of them are retired farmers. I ought to add that I have always found them good neighbours.—(*Signed*) SOZONTE PETROWIEZ SANEGOROFF, February 22, 1892.

(5) Living for four years not far from the Jewish colony of Novopoltawka, with which I am in frequent relation, I can affirm from my own observations that the Jewish colonists of Novopoltawka occupy themselves with agriculture, and hire themselves for field work to the neighbouring proprietors.—(*Signed*) ALEXIS NICOLAIVIEZ, captain of the 2nd regiment rank. February 12, 1892, Ekaterinowka village.

(6) The farm of Nicolas Nicolaewiez of Lacour, Gorojono village, February 20, 1892.—I certify that the Jews of Novopoltawka, whose lands join mine, occupy themselves with agriculture and other field work.—(*Signed*) CORNETTE DE LACOUR, landed proprietor.

(7) (Certificate.)—The farm of Kaspar Nicolaewski offers to certify that the Jewish colonists of "Efengar" and "Dobroie," in the district of Cherson, are hired every year, by the abovementioned farms, as labourers, to sow the winter and the spring wheat, and the work in certain fields is confided to them alone, tilling, sowing, &c., and they acquit themselves very well as skilled agriculturists. Further, full of resources for supporting themselves and their families, they do in winter all that there is to be done. They cut fuel, put the sheafs in ricks, carry straw and fodder, drive and convey goods from the station to the farm—in a word, there is not any field work that they do not carry out honestly and carefully during all

the year, for more than twenty years. February 20, 1892. J. BOUTOWIEZ, landed proprietor.

(8) January 1892.—We, the undersigned German village agriculturists and Russian peasants, neighbours to the Jewish colonies of the rural department "Grafski," in the government of Ekaterinoslaw, seeing the request of the provost of the rural (Schultz) colonies of Grafski, of Trondolonbouwka, Beer Ziroulski, of Netzaiewka, Leiba Schnukal de Grafski Beer Komissaruk, of Selenaia Pole Aisik Schwidler, of Nadejnaia Piesach Swirski, and of Sladkowodnaia, Isaac Gueberowiez deliver this to the effect to testify that the Jews of the abovementioned colonies occupy themselves with agriculture with energy, cultivate their lands on the same footing as the peasant proprietors of the same class, are in character moral, temperate, and honest. In support of which we add our names.—(*Signed*) D. SCHMIDT and G. SCHMIDT, proprietors; AIXENTI BURIAK, T. SATZERKLIANY, peasants of the village of Federowka; A. BONDARENKO, proprietor; KOSTENKO ANTONE G. BORETZ, peasant of the village of Ganzolo; I. KOCK, proprietor of Renfield and the Starosta of Renfield Frei.

Truly the Jewish agriculturists of the colonies of Grasskaia, Nadejnaia, Sladkowodnaia, and Telenaia Pole, in the department of Grafski, work with their own hands as agriculturists, and cultivate the ground which has been granted to them by Government on an equal footing with their Greek, German, and Russian neighbours. In proof of this I add the administrative seal, February 6, 1892.—(*Signed*) the Chief of the District (Zemski Naczalnik) WLADIMIR MICHAILOWIEZ KOROSTOWEZEFF.

(9) (Certificate.)—Ministry of the Interior—Government of Ekaterinoslaw, District of Alexandrowsk, Administration of the Commune of Temirof, No. 72.—Delivered by the Administration of the Commune of Temirof to attest the fact that the agricultural Jews in the neighbouring colonies of Priontnaia,

Roskoschnaio, Bogadarowka, and Gorkaia, in the Department Priontinski, in the district of Alexandrowsk, occupy themselves really with agriculture, and cultivate with their own hands the lots of arable land with the same diligence as our own rural population; each one possesses enough good utensils and instruments, and cattle for work and for breeding as well as horses; they lead a quiet and irreproachable life. In proof of which we sign with the seal of administration.—(*Signed*) for the Starosta, A. PARCHOMENKO, clerk.

(10) (Certificate.)—Ministry of the Interior, Government Ekaterinoslaw, Administration of the Commune Tourkenof, District of Alexandrowsk, February 9, 1892.—No 330. Delivered by the Administration of the Community of Tourkenof, to the effect, &c.—(*Signed*) Provosts of the village (Selski Starosta), J. SCHINKORENKO, A. ZOURTZENKO; M. MOLOSOWIEZ, clerk.

(11) (Certificate.)—January 24, 1892. We the undersigned neighbouring proprietors of the Jewish colonies of Novo-Slatopol, Weselaia, and Mejeritz, in the Department Slatopolsk, in the district of Alexandrowsk, in the government of Ekaterinoslaw, offer to certify that to our knowledge the Jewish agriculturists of the said colonies occupy themselves with agriculture with great energy, and yield nothing in field work to the peasant farmers of the same class. They have a fairly good number of agricultural instruments, and of cattle for labour and breeding; as to moral character they live an irreproachable life. In witness of this we sign ourselves. (Here follow the signatures of the Russian proprietors.)

Certificates in the same sense for the colonies of Ekaterinoslaw are also given by the Russian proprietors, Ladoga, Solotarenko, Leueff, Proba, F. Maier, E. Priba, and S. Priba.

With this evidence it may fairly be asserted that

given proper treatment, and placed on the soil under fair conditions, the Jew is no more inherently parasitic by nature than the Russian Grand Dukes, whose palaces on the Neva quays are the admiration of Christians from all parts of the world.

In this connection I may here record the admirable and dignified appeal of the late Baron de Hirsch to M. Pobedonosteff on behalf of his co-religionists. In this letter, dated Paris, May 7, 1891, to M. Pobedonosteff—after introducing me to his Excellency—he writes :—

"Perhaps your Excellency has learnt that I am occcupying myself in finding on the other side of the ocean, especially in the Argentine Republic, some large tracts of territory for the purpose of settling some of my co-religionists who are Russian subjects. I have sent with this object to Buenos Ayres money and authority to proceed with the establishment of all things that are necessary for the preliminary organisation of the colonies which I have determined to start, but notwithstanding the speed with which I am carrying on these operations, they involve, as your Excellency may well understand without difficulty, considerable delays, and there must elapse a certain time before they can be actually accomplished.

"Under these circumstances, I have thought myself able to appeal to your Excellency's feelings and generosity that you would be good enough to apply your high influence with the authorities concerned in order to obtain a suspension in the execution of the measures recently decided with regard to the Israelites established in certain parts of the Russian Empire. I am not in any way invoking your Excellency's intervention for the withdrawal of these measures, knowing well that such a step on my part would be denounced beforehand and would have no chance of success, but the terrible effects which the

suspension of the May Laws will produce suggest that their execution should be at least in part relaxed in such a way as to allow a certain number of these unhappy people to obtain the conditions of a new life in the colonies which I am now engaged in preparing for them, and also to spare them in the interval the existence of privations, a life of mendicancy, and the frightful misery to which they will be subjected in the absence of any resources and any assured domicile.

"I venture to count on your Excellency not to refuse your most powerful assistance in this work of humanity, and I pray you in this hope to believe in the assurance of my high consideration."

The case for the Jews of Russia would be incomplete without a recapitulation of a few of the special laws in force against them.

### RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDENCE

1. The Jews of Russia have long been compelled—with certain exceptions only—to reside either in Poland or in the towns within the adjoining provinces known as the "Pale of Jewish Settlement," but which contain comparatively few towns.

2. They may not live within fifty versts (about thirty-three miles) of the frontier. The effect is to prevent them carrying on trade with neighbouring countries.

### EXPULSIONS FROM VILLAGES

3. Under the May Laws, which prohibit Jews from settling "outside of cities and towns," those settled in villages since May 1882 are expelled therefrom, and driven into the over-crowded towns of the Pale.

4. Under certain decisions of the Senate, Jews settled

in villages before May 1882 have the right of remaining there, but only provided they do not move therefrom. Many have been driven out who had settled there because their names had not been inscribed as villagers, or because they had temporarily left the village, in some cases to perform their military duty.

5. Suburbs of towns and small towns have been in many cases declared villages, and the Jews have been expelled therefrom.

6. Under the May Laws, Jews are prohibited from owning or holding on lease or even managing land, nor can they take a mortgage of land. Those, therefore, who have the right to remain villagers, in consequence of the settlement before 1882, cannot find a livelihood, and must migrate to the over-crowded towns of the Pale.

EXPULSIONS

7. Until lately Jews of all classes were allowed to reside in the Grand Duchy of Finland and in Courland. Since last year all who were not artisans or merchants of the First Guild have been expelled and driven into the Pale.

8. Jews have lately been also expelled in large numbers from certain important commercial centres outside the Pale, such as Rostoff on the Don, Tomsk in Siberia, and other towns, where, for commercial reasons, they had hitherto been allowed to settle; also from the Trans-Caspian provinces, and from Batoum and other Asiatic places formerly owned by Turkey.

9. In all these cases of expulsion the Jews have to find the means of removal by selling off their goods

and chattels, as they cannot collect debts when they are known to be under orders to leave. If they then are unable to find money to pay for removal, they are forwarded to the Pale of Settlement, however distant that may be, by *étape—i.e.*, in chains—by the side of condemned criminals, and under the guard of prison wardens. Jewesses are, however, allowed to remain if they will apply for a yellow ticket and become enrolled as prostitutes.

10. The result of all these expulsions is not only to deprive of their livelihood the persons expelled, but also to injure the original inhabitants of the towns of the Pale, who have to sustain the grinding competition of new arrivals, to incur the burden of a crowd of pauperised people, and to find them house-space within limits that were already too contracted.

11. Beside expulsions from Russia proper into the Jewish Pale, a very large number of expulsions of foreign Jews have taken place, not only from Russia proper, but from the Pale itself. Any Jew unable to prove the place of his birth may be prosecuted, and, as registration was formerly a lax institution in Russia, prosecutions and expulsions of Jews, as alien vagrants, or as rogues and vagabonds (brodyags), are of no rare occurrence.

### RESTRICTIONS ON EDUCATION

12. The attainment by a Jew of the highest degree in any university faculty entitles him to the privilege of residing outside the Pale. A large number of Jews have hitherto been candidates for university distinctions; but recent laws have limited admission not only

to the universities but to the gymnasia, the proportion fixed being ten per cent. in the Pale, five per cent. outside it, and three per cent. in St. Petersburg and Moscow. The Jews are not allowed schools of their own. In the special technical schools built and endowed by certain rich Jews, the proportion of Jews is limited just as if they had been established by the Government.

13. Jewish children attending the public schools are required to be present on the Jewish Sabbath.

### ARTISANS' PRIVILEGES RESCINDED

14. Skilled artisans and their families have hitherto been allowed to reside outside the Pale of Settlement. Under recent laws, if the Jewish artisans residing in Russia proper are found inefficient in their trade, or not actually in work, or past work by reason of age, they are expelled.

15. Skilled artisans, who formerly held the right of permanent residence in Moscow and St. Petersburg, have lately been deprived of that right by an arbitrary and summary administrative order.

16. The definition of "skilled artisan" has been contracted for the purpose of excluding Jews. It has lately been declared that bakers, vinegar makers, glaziers, printers' compositors, and other workers in like occupations, are not artisans, and Jews carrying on these trades have been expelled from towns in Russia proper.

### RESTRICTIONS ON OCCUPATIONS

17. Jews are not allowed to sell intoxicants except

in houses which they own. Jewish waiters may be employed only by Jews.

18. Jews are not allowed to engage in any mining industry, or to hold mining shares, or to act as agents for persons engaged in mining.

19. Those Jews who, as high graduates of a university, or as merchants of the First Guild (men paying at least 1000 roubles taxation annually), are allowed to reside outside the Pale, may have no more than two Jewish employés in their service. (A privileged Jew, who wishes his aged parents to reside with him outside the Pale, frequently registers the one as his valet and the other as his cook.)

20. Jews are prohibited from forwarding goods, as agents or employés, from the frontier custom houses to localities outside the Pale.

### PROFESSIONS AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS

21. Jews are not allowed to occupy any government or public appointment. They have accordingly been dismissed from railway and post-office service, from the posts of schoolmaster, and from notarial offices. They may no longer be appointed doctors, or even veterinary surgeons, in the army. No Jew may become an advocate, though fully qualified by examination, without the special sanction of the Minister of the Interior, which has not once been given. No dentist or apothecary of Jewish extraction is to receive a licence to practise. No Jew may become an officer in the army, though bound to serve in the rank and file, like all other Russians. The penalty of evading military

service is higher for the Jew than for others. No Jew may serve in the navy.

22. No Jew may be elected mayor, councillor, or police magistrate, nor may he hold any other town office. The law says, "The duties of judges cannot be entrusted to Jews with convenience or decency."

### SPECIAL TAXES ON FOOD, ETC.

23. There is a special tax called the "box tax," levied on the animals killed according to Jewish ritual law—a tax payable on the slaughter of the animal, and another on its retail sale. There are also special taxes on house property owned by Jews, on business profits of Jews, on the skull-caps used by Jews during domestic prayer, and on the Sabbath candles used by the Jews.

### DIRECT RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS

24. Jews on reaching their fourteenth year may be received into the Orthodox Church, notwithstanding the objection of their parents. All Jews, on conversion, receive from the State a considerable subvention, and are thenceforth free from all disqualifications.

25. Synagogues are only allowed in places where there are no fewer than eighty Jewish houses. Jews holding divine worship in their houses without official permission are punished by law.

### ALIENATED AND BLACKMAILED

26. The Russian law declares all Jews "to be aliens whose several rights are regulated by special ordinances." This law and the mass of special ordinances cause the Jews to be regarded as a pariah caste.

27. The minute legal restrictions which hem in every action of the Jew, and compel him to obtain police sanction for everything he requires to do, render him a ready subject for blackmail, and he can only live by bribing. The property of the bulk of the Jews has now reached that stage where bribery is impossible. Hence, these restrictive laws are now enforced with all possible rigour.

## II

## THE CASE FOR RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

THE press of England and the United States, largely under the instigation of Hebrew proprietors and writers, suffers from a periodic fever of indignation against Russian dealings with the Hebrew population of Russia. The average interval is about ten years. The last occasion on which it woke up to the infamy of Muscovite persecution of the Chosen People was in 1891–1892. The new enforcement of the May Laws, the result of a phenomenally rapid increase in the Jewish population, in conjunction with the accession to power of M. Pobedonosteff, produced an explosion in humanitarian feeling from Stockholm to Cape Town and from London to Melbourne. The reasons why Russian Ministers deliberately persecute Jews are not generally understood in England or in the United States of America. But it must not be supposed that they have no case of their own, both to justify a policy of anti-Semitism, and to vindicate the righteousness of any measures necessary to scotch Jewish power in Russia.

It is easy for irresponsible and large-hearted Western

lovers of mankind, profoundly imbued with a sense of other men's sins, dwelling in freedom under constitutional law, to condemn the Muscovite method of dealing with the Jewish difficulty. Critics of Russian polity, however, rarely attempt to place themselves in the standpoint of those they condemn and to examine the problem with detachment of mind. Looked at through Russian spectacles the confinement of the Jews in the sixteen provinces of Western Russia known as the Pale, and in the ten provinces of Poland, is not only an act of reasonable statesmanship, but no other policy is compatible with the development of Holy Russia on national lines.

Let us look at the facts. When Russia in the last century took part in the division of Poland, that country with Galicia had long been the head-quarters of the Jews of the world. Into these regions they had spread from Hungary, Moravia, and even from England after the expulsion of 1292. Some of them had taken refuge from the atrocities perpetrated by the early Crusaders, some had settled after fleeing from persecutions by the Flagellants. The paternal government of Casimir the Great in the fourteenth century attracted a large Jewish population to what is now the Ghetto of Europe. His enlightened rule secured to the Jews their privileges and their rights, and set forth their duties as subjects. He had the good sense to appreciate the value of trade and industry to the wealth and happiness of the country. The reason for this flash of enlightenment in the dark ages is attributed to the influence on Casimir of a beautiful Jewish mistress named Esther. Other circumstances concurred in

securing immunity from persecution to the Jews, and with security their numbers, wealth, and influence multiplied in the centre of Europe.

If Poland were formerly hospitable, Russia proper from ancient times has always set her face against the Children of Israel. The Russians have always hated them. Many reasons combine to inspire the Tsar's subjects with the antipathy that has been so dramatically displayed by his Imperial Government in recent times. In the wars with the Turks the Jews were accused of having perfidiously supplied the enemy with iron artillery, a charge which strangely enough was repeated by Wellington three centuries later. To the end of his life the Iron Duke barely tolerated the Jews because he believed that Jewish financiers resident in England had furnished Napoleon with ordnance which was used against the English. Another reason for Russian Jew hatred is found in the fact that in the fifteenth century an important Jewish sect effected an entrance to Russian society. Crypto-Judaism long smouldered in the bosom of the Russian Church. Whether it is extinguished even to-day is a matter of doubt. For political, theological, racial, social, and religious reasons the Russians have long hated Judaism.

In the following centuries Russia never abandoned her inveterate dislike of the Jews, but nevertheless her passion for territorial expansion brought about the very result that the persistent intolerance of centuries of statesmanship had attempted to avert. As Russia gained province after province of her western frontier the wealthiest inhabitants were of the Jewish race. Her stern and exclusive policy was necessarily modified

when the partition of Poland added at least half a million Jews to the otherwise homogeneous race subject to the Tsar. To-day the irony of fate decrees that half the Jews in existence are subject to the rule of the one Great Power whose secular policy it has been to separate her own people from the descendants of the Children of the Dispersion. It is thus evident that, when Russia became the chief accomplice in the murder of Polish liberty and received her share of the plunder, with the territory she coveted, the poisonous Jewish Question infected her life-blood. She acquired the disease in a peculiarly intractable form. However the partition of Poland may be characterised, whether it was wise or foolish, wicked or necessary, it was not the act of this generation. It is futile to speculate on what might have been if Russian statesmanship had foreseen the sinister issues with which the act of Polish annexation was inseparably fraught.

The Polish Jews are prolific beyond record. For a hundred years they have multiplied as no people on earth have multiplied ; if they have not waxed mighty they are increasing at four times the rate of the Russians, who themselves are the most prolific nation in Christendom. Russian statesmen of to-day, when reflecting on these facts, are compelled to regard themselves as trustees for a peasantry—intellectually undeveloped and numbering a hundred million souls—who are as backward in civilisation as the English of the seventeenth century. Education has not touched them with her finger tip. Superstitious as West African negroes the Russian peasant, especially in his cups, falls an easy prey to the astute and temperate Oriental

race which exploits his vices and plays with ease upon his superstitions and his prejudices for the purpose of gain. These peasants, if ignorant and credulous, are industrious, faithful, and devoted to their Emperor. The Jews, on the other hand, in the eyes of Russian Ministers are cosmopolitans—Russian neither in blood, religion, nor instinct. The moujik delights in manual labour, in vodka, in the worship of icons. The Jew detests manual labour, shuns the open air, is temperate like other Oriental races, abhors the worship of images, pictures, or relics, while despising the people who adore them. Jewish vices are as abhorrent to the generous Russians as Jewish virtues. Confinement in the Ghettos of Europe for nearly two thousand years has cured the Jews of their taste for the pastoral theocracy which cradled their race and has driven those who combine the dreams of the Ghetto with a career to become middlemen and money-lenders. Statesmen have to deal with what exists, not to speculate on what might have been if something *had* happened which as a matter of fact never *did* happen.

Whatever may be the cause of the moral deterioration of the Jewish inhabitants of the Russian Pale, there is no doubt that the Russian view of their general character is largely held by impartial persons who best know the Russian Jews but are not themselves Russians. Consul H. P. Smith, of Odessa, in his Report to the British Foreign Office, dated January 1898, writes as follows :

A word of warning ought to be given to all manufacturers to avoid doing business with Jews who seek credit in this

branch (agricultural machinery). Experience teaches that they take up this trade with the original intention of sooner or later defrauding those firms who are induced to give them credit, and I would seriously advise all British firms to avoid doing business with them upon credit terms.

Consul Smith's official remarks greatly injured him from a business point of view, owing to the millionaire Jews of Kieff using their influence against him at the local banks. The episode illustrates (a) the solidarity of the Jewish community when individual members of it are attacked from outside, and (b) the justification for Russian anti-Semitism, so far as the trade in agricultural machinery is concerned.

Readers who have had the patience to follow this recapitulation of the main factors of the Russo-Jewish problem will admit that the case presented to Russian statesmen is by no means so simple as it seems to slap-dash Western philanthropy. But there is still another element which the rulers of Russia are constrained to take into their consideration. The intellect of the Jew is masterful. His assiduity, his deadly resolve to get on, his self-denial and ambition surmount all natural obstacles. If all careers in the Russian Empire were thrown open to the Russian Jew, not a decade would go by before the whole Russian administration from Port Arthur to Eydtkuhnen and from Archangel to Yalta must pass into Hebraic hands. This is a sober statement of fact. The Russian nature is self-indulgent, impulsive, kind-hearted, generous, and passionate. Russians would have no chance of survival against the cold determination of a people that exists only when

living as a parasitic growth on another race. What Tsar in his senses, what sane Russian Minister would permit his country to commit suicide by ceding the civil administration to a Jewish minority? England does not invest the Bengali with power in India because he passes difficult examinations with the greatest ease. But this is precisely what is involved in the antidotes of education and equality so glibly prescribed by Anglo-Saxon doctrinaires, who condemn Russia without understanding the difficulties with which she has to deal, and who do not treat their own racial problems on abstract principles.

The Russian Government do not attach so much importance to the so-called impartial reports on the Jewish Question which have appeared in English and American books and newspapers. The journey of Messrs. Kempster and Weber, the American Commissioners on the causes of immigration to the United States of America, was undertaken and carried out by men who had made up their minds before any of the facts had been examined. No doubt Messrs. Kempster and Weber are accurate and conscientious observers, but from conversations held with these gentlemen in St. Petersburg before they set out on their journey through Russia to collect facts, it was evident to me what their report would be, and I do not think that it deserves the attention that should only be paid to a judicial examination of facts undertaken by competent observers whose minds are open to both sides of the case.

With regard to the late Mr. Harold Frederic, whose work "The New Exodus," is quoted as an authority by

Mr. Lecky in his "Democracy and Liberty," as one "founded on close personal investigation," it is said, and I believe truly, in Russia that Mr. Frederic was only travelling in the country for a few weeks, that he never left the main line of tourist travel, and that first-class carriages and the reports of interested persons are not the materials that constitute a claim for universal credence. Russians, at all events, may be excused if they regard with indifference attacks on their system which wholly ignore anything that is to be said on the other side of the case.

In 1891 the Lord Mayor of London, and many eminent, wise, and wealthy men, met in mass meeting at the Guildhall, London, to appeal to the Tsar to mitigate the laws enforced against his Majesty's Jewish subjects. The fragrance of sentiment filled the air. Sympathy cost nothing, involved no responsibility, no outlay of cash or energy. The nobility of the humane sentiments thus rhetorically expressed was remarkable. Their practical effect was *nil*. The Guildhall resolve was sent by the Lord Mayor to the Emperor Alexander III. His Majesty, looking upon his Hebrew subjects as the lineal descendants of the murderers of Christ, was not favourably impressed by the invasion of British emotion into the domain of high Imperial policy. His Majesty was unable to appreciate the connection between Russian State policy and the unreformed Corporation of the City of London. Accordingly the Guildhall resolution was replaced in an envelope by the Russian Ambassador at the Court of St. James's, and sent without comment to the British Foreigh Office, from whence it was

passed on to the Lord Mayor, who had no power, good easy man, to resent the insult. Snubbed by the Tsar, Guildhall philanthropy harboured no resentment. By the time that the Lord Mayor's resolution embodying the humanitarian instincts of all men who are not devils was flung back in his face the philanthropists were already thinking of something else. To-day these very men are screaming for a Russian alliance, although nothing has been done for the Jews. Jews of the Pale, on whose behalf Englishmen felt too strongly to act discreetly, were no better off than if the Guildhall meeting had never been held. Possibly, indeed, their condition is even worse than ever. Still, for a time, the Jews of Western Europe and the United States affected to carry on a serious agitation on behalf of their brethren. They published a journal in the English language entitled *Darkest Russia*, and for a time real indignation was exhibited by the good Jews of the world against the persecutor of their co-religionists. *Darkest Russia* recommended that travelling Russians should be boycotted. M. Pobedonosteff was compared to Torquemada. Jewish pens were dipped in gall, and if ink in gallons and paper in reams could have converted Russia from the error of her ways, there is no doubt that by now her Jewish subjects would have begun to oust Russian administrators.

As a matter of fact Russia went on her way rejoicing. She did nothing, absolutely nothing, and to-day the condition of the Jews of the Pale is worse than it was at the time when the Guildhall meeting was held. The Jews have multiplied. The means of existence have not increased. Two pieces of black bread and one

herring have to go farther to-day than was necessary ten years ago. Russia is, however, protected against the Jewish peril, so far as the May Laws can protect her.

If a tithe of the unanswered charges made against the Russian Government in respect of their anti-Semitic policy were true, the attitude of the great Jewish banking-houses in their financial dealings with Russia is incomprehensible. No one could have conceived it possible that during the appearance of *Darkest Russia*, the wealthier Hebrew banks of the West would consent to supply the persecutor of their race with funds, partly to be employed in paying the administration that humiliates, debases, and tyrannises over their co-religionists. In 1892 the publication known as *Darkest Russia* suddenly ceased. In the interests of the suffering victims of Russian administrative conditions there may have been reasons why this publication should never have been commenced. The reason for its suppression, however, shortly became apparent.

By those who knew the calamitous meaning of Jewish suffering in the Pale it was naturally supposed that the moment of Russia's pecuniary extremity would supply the racial opportunity for the richer Jews to intervene on behalf of their persecuted brethren. It was open to them, before lending money to Russia, to impose upon the Tsar's Ministers such conditions as would secure for the Jews of the Pale some immunity from needlessly hostile treatment at the hands of the tchinovniks and adequate protection from the equally hostile peasantry. Nothing of the kind was done. In

1894 the development of her policy in the Far East, the completion of the great Siberian Railway, the cost of acquiring warm water ports in the Pacific, the development of the Manchurian policy, and the necessity for the re-arming of the infantry obliged the Russian Minister of Finance to look abroad for cash. He went a-borrowing, and as the finances of Europe are in the hands of the Jews, to the Jews he accordingly applied. In 1894 Hebrew capitalists held Holy Russia in the hollow of their hands. It was Israel's psychological hour. They could have boycotted the Tsar; they could have insisted on the Holy Synod mending its ways and relaxing its grip upon the frightened and hungry Children of the Ghetto. They did nothing of the kind—the Hebrew capitalists resisted the almost overpowering temptation to come to the rescue of their suffering race with a force that, in the long run, is mightier than the sword, and at all times is mightier than the pen of the pressman.

There is no reason why the motives of these capitalists should be questioned. They might have been the noblest imaginable. In the case of prominent Hebrew English capitalists concerned, I believe that the amount of the loan for which they were responsible was of trifling importance, that the profits derived from lending money to Russia on that occasion and for that purpose were paltry, and that, so far as they were concerned, it is not the fact that the desire of gain in this specific transaction was the motive that induced them to associate themselves with the affair. Other and not unreasonable explanations were forthcoming. Still the fact remains that the Russian loan was made

by Jewish capitalists; that the loan thus made by Jewish capitalists was guaranteed and taken firm by them, and that not only was the money lent, but responsibility for the unsubscribed portions of the loan, if any, was guaranteed by Jewish lenders. And, finally, when the loan was actually placed, no specific conditions of any kind were made that would have redeemed the wretched Jewish population herded in the slum cities of the Pale. In Russia I was told by responsible authorities in the administrative sphere that no private conditions were made. The Jewish press remained dumb as to the cruelty of the transaction, or exulted in it by defending the capitalists. *Darkest Russia* had ceased to appear. No Jewish voice of weight was raised, so far as I know, to beseech the millionaires in the name of humanity to desist from money-lending to the assassin of their race, and helping to perpetuate "that most hideous story of our century." The propertied Jews in the West of Europe and in the United States were dumb, and when a protest in the name and for the interests of the suffering millions of the Pale was raised by a non-Jew, the defence of the great money-lenders was ostentatiously undertaken by the Jewish press. Russia got her loan, the lenders received their profits, and in some mysterious fashion word was passed around that the lot of the Russian Jews was ameliorated. There was not a word of truth in this report. The condition of the Russian Jews to-day is what it was in 1891, with the additional embarrassment that the fecundity of the Jews exceeds that of other children of men. They are worse off to-day because their numbers are

greater. The golden opportunity was lost, never to return.

Under the circumstances described, is it surprising that Russians deny, on the one hand, the existence of any serious grievances on the part of the Jew, and assert, on the other hand, that the administrative regulations that are put in force are no more than is necessary to effect the separation of the Orthodox Russian from the lineal descendants of the murderers of Christ?

The following statement, which was submitted to the late Emperor by the then Minister of the Court, Count Vorontzoff-Dashkoff, is not without interest. With the exception of the agricultural and technical training schools, the requests contained in this memorandum were granted by the Russian Government, a tolerable proof that there is no inherent desire to injure the Jews without cause:

St. Petersburg,
*June* 16–28, 1891.

Having regard to the abnormal situation of the Russian Jews, to the fact that many of them are vagabond and half fed, seeking homes wherever they can find outlets, and to the fact that hitherto the effort to escape has been a disorganised flight, without guidance, aim or reason, the Baron de Hirsch (deeply moved for his co-religionists) has asked me to study in Russia the question of Jewish colonisation, and to seek from the Government their effectual support to a coherent and well-organised plan for settling the poorer Jews in Argentina.

In pursuit of that object I have journeyed through Russia, and have found good material for the colonies, in the shape of sober, hard-working, and moral men and women, glad to engage in agriculture, and I consider, therefore, with the aid of the

after final letter
to Hirsch

Government in regard to the following four points, the success of the Baron's scheme is assured. Without that aid I see no means of organising a plan designed to end the present state of confusion and distress, the more especially among the little children.

The following are the four points on which Government aid is needed:

(1) Permission is required to obtain good local advice. Emigration committees, composed of worthy and respected Jews, are required in each town in order—

(a) To select families for emigration;

(b) To spend the money remitted by Baron de Hirsch;

(c) To control, organise, and superintend the assembly and departure of emigrant parties;

(d) To act as channels of communication between the Government, Baron de Hirsch, and the emigrants.

A central committee in St. Petersburg will also be needed.

Under existing laws the Jews must either organise their emigration arrangements secretly or not at all. If Government grant permission to form committees, they would require to be represented on those committees in order that disloyal persons may be excluded and to see that the committees are not used for purposes not contemplated by the Government.

(2) The passport system as it affects the emigrant Jews needs revision. A door must be open or shut. The Russian door is shut. It is necessary therefore to modify the costly and onerous passport system and to replace it by free emigration certificates. The holders of these certificates should be deprived of all rights and exempted from all duties as Russian citizens after the frontier is crossed. No extra penalty of additional military service ought to be imposed on the Jews who remain in Russia.

(3) Gratuitous railway transport to the Russian frontier

should be granted to all poor holders of emigration certificates.

(4) Baron de Hirsch's scheme will require years to perfect. We must look ahead. After the first *corps d'élite* is started as the pioneer body, we shall have a second-rate, ignorant population with which to deal. Some of the young Jews ought therefore to be trained in manual labour and in agriculture. Artisan and agricultural schools should therefore be started. There is no danger in this. Nihilists are the result of university training and empty stomachs. With hard manual labour and out-door field-work the Jews will be moralised, strengthened, and prepared for colonisation.

To sum up, we ask:

(1) Power to appoint emigration committees;
(2) Gratuitous certificates of emigration;
(3) Railway transport to frontier;
(4) Liberty to form agricultural and technical training schools.

(*Signed*) ARNOLD WHITE.

## III

## THE JEW IN RUSSIA: THEIR NUMBERS

THE first complete census of the Russian Empire was taken in February 1897. The figures are not yet complete, but the Central Statistical Commission of the Minister of the Interior annually publishes figures of the rate of increase of the Russian population which demonstrate the overwhelming importance of the Jewish Question to the ruler and people of Russia.

In most of the text-books published on the subject of the Jewish population in the world the number of Jews in Russia is greatly under-rated. The late Sir Robert Morier, G.C.B., as British Ambassador for many years at St. Petersburg, gave great attention to the subject. In 1891 he was of opinion that the Jewish population in Russia was about 5,250,000, the figures being arrived at by the statistics of birth-rate, death-rate, and conscription. The totals of the deaths, births, and marriages of the various religions in European Russia supply the absolute data. These figures have been elaborated by Mr. E. J. Dillon.* The figures of the birth- and death-rates, when compared, establish the ratio between the two. For every

* *Fortnightly Review.* January 1898.

100 Russian Jews who died during the decade ending 1892, the number born was 171.42. The number of Orthodox Christians per cent. born in Russia during the same period was only 138.14 per cent. This fecundity of the Jewish race is attributable to the universal practice of marriage, and to the phenomenally low death-rate; 407 Orthodox Russian infants died out of every thousand. Only 232 Jewish children died. But these figures do not really indicate the rapidity with which the Jewish population is growing. Military service is immensely unpopular among the Jews, and they resort to many devices in order to free their sons from liability to serve in the army. One method is the concealment of the births of their children, and the number of Jews is, therefore, greater, and the death-rate is, therefore, lower, than the official statistics actually show.

This relatively small death-rate of the Jews is noticeable, not only in Russia, but also in New York and in Roumania. The Jews form but one-fifth of the urban population of Roumania, but they contribute no less than 63 per cent. of the entire annual increase, whereas the Orthodox Christians, who amount to 72 per cent. of the inhabitants of the towns and Cities, contribute no more than 39.9 per cent. to the total annual increase.

Both in Russia and Roumania the Jewish element is better fitted for the struggle for existence than any of the Christian sects. The devotion bestowed by Jewish parents on their children, the respect and tenderness paid to women during the critical events of their family life, enable the Jewish element in Poland to

increase twice as rapidly as the Christian sects. One-third of the population of Warsaw is Jewish, but the Hebrew increase is equal to that of the Christians who form two-thirds of the population. The more Jews there are in a city the smaller the death-rate among children. In Warsaw the Jews are one-third of the population, and the death-rate of 1000 children during the first year of their lives is only 187. In Moscow, where the Jews are only 2 per cent., the death-rate of infants is 391.*

The Russian people, with the exception of the Jews, have the highest birth-rate and the highest death-rate of all the peoples of Europe. Of all the races and religious faiths professed in Russia the Jewish element is the most fruitful. In the cities and towns of the sixteen provinces which constitute the Jewish Pale, the Israelitish increase is four times more rapid than that of their Christian fellow subjects. Their net annual increase amounts to 71.4 as compared with that of all the Christian denominations, which is only 17 souls. Their annual increase appears to amount to 80,000 a year, a rate which will continue to increase in the absence of pestilence, famine, or extermination.

* Reclus states that the Jewish element in Hungary has increased by eight times its number during the past hundred years. During the years 1868–1870 the death-rate of the various religions in Budapest was: among Catholics, 48.0; Calvinists, 33.7; Lutherans, 46.6; and Jews only 18.2 per thousand souls.

## IV

## THE JEW AS AGRICULTURIST

On the first occasion of my visiting St. Petersburg to examine the Jewish Question, and negotiate with Russian Ministers on behalf of Baron de Hirsch, two sentences of M. Probedonosteff's conversation at our first interview indicated the insolubility of the Jewish Question (according to the Russian view) by means of colonisation or migration. He stated in reply to a suggestion that colonisation was a possible means of providing for the natural increase of the Jewish population, provided sufficient money and Anglo-Saxon management were provided, that he was of a different opinion. He proceeded to declare that the parasitic characteristics of the Jewish race were a permanent bar to settlement or colonisation on their own account. "Take them," he said, "off the living organism to which they cling, put them on a rock, and they die. They cannot cultivate the soil. They are hereditary middlemen." I suggested that they were an agricultural theocracy originally, and that although a few generations might be required to recover agricultural or pastoral aptitudes, the germ was not extinct. The Procurator of the Holy Synod denied this, contending

that the Jewish artisans are not artisans, that they are only colourably artisans, and that their hearts and brains are engaged indissolubly and for all time in broking and middleman traffic. He instanced a case of thirty watchmakers, out of whom only two were acquainted with the trade they ostensibly professed ; he referred to the influence of the Jews on the drinking habits of the Russian people and the amount of capital and influence expended by them in the exploitation of the grosser vices among Russian people. The industry and temperance of the Jews, while fatal to the impulsive and undeveloped character of the mass of the population, did not add to the strength of the nation, because these virtues were devoted to the extraction of profit from the industry of others and not to the increase in wealth of the country. He described how the land was mapped out for exploitation by the Jews, but the cry of the peasants, the call of the Church, and the need for maintaining, in its purity and strength, Russian nationality, required measures of restriction that must be inexorable, and cannot be relaxed if they are to succeed.

I cite this view of a Russian statesman who has passed the whole of his life since manhood in the centre of affairs, and who has probably wielded a greater influence over the whole Empire, albeit partially indirect, than any other Minister. It cannot be denied that, with one exception, such experiments as have been tried with Jewish colonisation are not of a promising nature, and yield little satisfaction to their promoters. The exception to which I refer is the attempt of the Emperor Nicholas I., at the beginning of the

century, to establish Jewish colonies in the Province of Kherson.

As I saw for myself the actual condition of the Nicholas colonies, the following account of them may not be devoid of interest.

In examining the condition of the Jews planted on the soil I visited the agricultural Jewish colonies of Dobraye, Yeffingar, Novaia Poltavka, Nicolaieff, Ekaterinoslaw, Kremenchug, Homel, Minsk, and Wilna.

I had advantages in my journey. M. Pobedonosteff kindly gave me an autograph letter describing my mission, and the Minister of the Interior accredited me to all the governors of the provinces concerned. It will be apparent from this that I enjoyed exceptional advantages in learning the official view of the case. I must say that although I found the higher officials frank, charming, and courteous, they, with a few exceptions, took their colour from St. Petersburg, and I attached, therefore, more importance to the views of Tchinovniks not so highly placed as to come under the direct influence of the capital.

The Jews also gave me the best credentials. Everywhere I went I met the most respectable Jews, I also saw the most downtrodden and the poorest. By this means I not only sifted the Government evidence in the Israelite sieve, but was also able to weigh the value of the Hebrew evidence in Russian scales. I examined over two hundred witnesses, whose testimony, together with my own careful observations, led me to the following conclusions. During the journey I was accompanied by a Russian-Jewish gentleman, who speaks the

"jargon"—half Hebrew and half German—of the Chosen People, and to whose loyal help and ever ready energy I am deeply indebted.

Assuming two things, first, that the Jewish population of Russia amounts to over 5,000,000; and, second, that the Jews I saw are a fair sample of the Jews I did not see—I do not consider more than 20 per cent. of the adult males, *at the present time*, to be physically fit to bear the strain inseparable from settlement in a new country, under strange conditions, and with physical hardships to endure. As a whole, the sedentary Jews are physically inferior to the sedentary Russians, while the out-of-door Jews are but a handful. Indeed, I can remember no country in Europe the town population of which does not excel, in physique, the poor Russian-Jew townsman. When, however, I contrast the Jew townsmen with the Jews settled by the Emperor Nicholas in the Government of Kherson, the difference is amazing. I found the latter an active, well set-up, sunburnt, muscular agricultural population, marked by all the characteristics of a peasantry of high character. There are 30,000 of these people: a mere drop in the bucket, it is true, but enough to show what stuff is in Israel. So far as I could learn from the neighbouring proprietors—Russians—who employed them, they have no vice, unless early, improvident, and inordinately fruitful marriages are to be deemed a vice.

Besides these agriculturists there is a population of 300,000 able-bodied men who are engaged in arduous manual labour in or about the towns. As instances of this class I may cite the 10,000 labourers and

artisans of Berdicheff, the wharf labourers of Odessa, the corn porters of Nicolaieff, and the agricultural labourers of Kremenchug, of whom at least 4000 are hired out at harvest time by neighbouring proprietors. All these men are fit for colonisation, though all are not equally fit.

But as a set-off against the physical inferiority to which reference has been made, two elements must be taken into consideration in any analysis of the worth of the Jew as a colonist, which, in my opinion, more than compensate for his poverty in muscle. The first of these elements is the highly nervous temperament of the average Jew, which is not only the source of all the accusations of cowardice brought against him, but at the same time gives him an astounding capacity to sustain exertion for lengthy periods of time impossible to the stolid, beer-drinking Englishman or equally self-indulgent Russ. This quality of "last" is an atonement Nature has made to the Russian Jew for denying him a coarser fibre and a larger build.

The second element in the problem is a factor the value of which can only be assessed by those who have actually undergone the heart-breaking task of planting poor unemployed Englishmen on unemployed colonial acres. I refer to the high moral tone of the average Jew. With one exception, the whole of my evidence points to the fact that the Jew is habitually temperate—he rarely drinks alcohol, rarely smokes; he is a good husband, father, son; he is not addicted to the use of filthy or blasphemous language; he is patient in trouble, and is most industrious in his work. Faults

he undoubtedly has, but they are not of a nature that enter seriously into the question of colonisation.

Of the typical Jew, as I so often heard him described in St. Petersburg—a compound of thief and usurer—I have not met one instance in the agricultural colonies. Of course, many such men exist, or how could the fiction have been floated? The fact is, the St. Petersburg conception of a Jew is evolved from the inner consciousness of certain Orthodox statesmen, and has no existence in fact. In Russia the Jew has been forced into commerce, and, being clever, has made a success of the only callings available to him. The only thing to moralise him, and to make him like other people, is to restore him to the land. That he *can* be moralised by sunshine and sweat is shown by the conspicuous success of the Emperor Nicholas' colonies, of which I cannot speak too highly.

So far as my observations go, the Russian Jew and his children have not enough to eat. Until I see what good nourishing food will do for him, it is impossible to say what proportion of the adult male population will eventually be capable of outdoor work. At present, dejection clouds the life of the whole Jewish population. But their misery is not, as yet, the parent of crime, on a large scale. The pressure of existence, the uncertainty of the future, and the actual want of tens of thousands under the present state of affairs, are an excellent criterion by which to judge the bearing and character of the Jews when under the stress of strain and struggle that will be incidental to the early years of the colonising scheme, in common with every other since the history of the world began.

In short, if courage—moral courage—hope, patience, temperance, are fine qualities, then the best Jews of Russia are a fine people. Such a people, under wise direction, is destined to make a success of any well-organised plan of colonisation. Nowhere is the truth of this statement more clearly demonstrated on a large scale than in the 60,000 hectares of land cultivated by Jews, situated in the governments of Kherson and Ekaterinoslaw. The population of 30,000 persons subsists almost entirely by agriculture. In the twenty-one colonies but one man cultivates fruit. The staple product is wheat, which grows freely, and in five years out of six is a profitable crop. The first of these Jew colonies was founded in 1804, but the bulk of them were established by the Emperor Nicholas in 1846, and to this day reflect lustre on his foresight and his statesmanship as showing by unanswerable demonstration the true method *de moraliser les Juifs*. Notwithstanding the onerous conditions under which the land is held, the population continues to increase, showing that with all the drawbacks attaching to a system under which the Jews may neither buy, sell, nor mortgage land, there is no inherent repugnance towards agriculture on the part of the Jewish people. The land belongs to the Crown, and the tenure is that of perpetual quit-rent. In the twenty-one colonies are thirteen schools. There is no drunkenness or serious crime, and the domestic virtues are nowhere seen to greater advantage than among the Hebrew peasantry who are rooted in the soil. Where the land is good the people succeed well and are contented; but the families rapidly increase, and distress from over-

population is already a marked feature. Only thirty dessiatines—about eighty acres—are allotted to each family, and as in some cases the families reach fifty souls it is easy to see that the pressure of existence is extremely hard. Every system of colonisation that provides no reserves of land for future increase of population is doomed to experience the same difficulties as those with which we are familiar in Ireland. In these Russian colonies the large families pay taxes on each member, but have no greater earning capacity than the smaller families, because they have no more land, an anomaly bitterly complained of.

I was told by one of the Rabbis that twenty years ago some of the people worked badly, but that since then, and especially since the Odessa riots of 1882, they have laboured with assiduity and courage. Another witness, the Christian intendant of a large Russian proprietor, stated that one objection to the poor agricultural Jews was that they took such tender care of their women that they would not allow them to work in the fields. I found, however, after careful investigation, that among the poorest families the women and girls work out of doors exactly as the French and Italian women are wont to do. Those families, however, in easier circumstances not only regard it as shameful to allow their females to undergo severe exertion in the fields, and therefore restrict them to household duties, but are morally sustained in their action by the value attached to child life, and the fear of inflicting irreparable injury on a woman who may be the mother of the Messiah.

It is not too much to say that the colonies I

am describing are the direct result of Sir Moses Montefiore's visit to the Emperor Nicholas in 1846, as the policy of assimilation and Russification was the direct result of the influence obtained by that great and good man over the mind and the conscience of a monarch more usually associated with the vices of Ivan the Terrible than with the virtues of Alexander II.

I was much concerned to ascertain the behaviour and actions of the Jewish colonists, most of whom came from Minsk, Grodno, and Wilna in 1846, during the early years of their installation. The following are the words of a great landowner of the neighbourhood, a Russian of the Orthodox faith: "From the first I can give them the highest character, but in the early days they wanted practice; but the people soon settled down, and the land moralised the men." On being asked what he meant by this, he said: "At first the great towns magnetised the weak souls, but in a short time the town taint was eradicated, and the land sweetened and purified the people." The whole of my evidence on this point was unanimous as to the absolute elimination of the evil characteristics generally attributed to town Jews when first rooted on the soil. This landowner's last words were: "Some of these Jew colonists are so good, so honest, and so skilled, it would be well if all the Christian colonists were like them." The girls do not go out as servants, as do our English lasses of a similar class, but remain at home until they are married.

It is said that there is no law so carefully drafted that a Jew cannot evade it. Nothing can be more

stringent than the May Laws of General Ignatieff, designed to prevent the Jews from acquiring land. The manner in which this law is evaded is a signal comment on the success with which the General induced his Sovereign in 1882 to revert to the thought and practice of the sixteenth century. The Jew obtains land from proprietors on his word of honour—*en parole*—from sheer force of his character. I know of many owners—one of them is a Russian Minister now in high office—whose land is let to a Jew on his word only, and without the exchange of a compromising document. Such a people is surely capable of being put to a better use than being huddled up in the slums of Polish towns, and deprived of all pride and title in the land in which they live and for which they fight.

A few particulars of some of the colonies may not be without interest.

I arrived at the colony of Dobraye at sundown on June 16. The straggling village consisted of 104 houses, many of them neat and substantial; others were in a state of decay, which gave an untidy air to the streets. On inquiry, however, I found that the uninhabited and tumbledown cottages were those originally inhabited by colonists who had outgrown their modest habitations, and who had prospered sufficiently to provide more ambitious residences. The population of the village amounted to 500 souls. That night I took the evidence of fifteen men, clad in long frock coats; serious, stalwart, sunburnt fellows. Among them was Visnawata, a blacksmith, of forty-two years of age, married, and

the father of three children. He had been thirty-seven years in Dobraye, was capable of making ploughs and carts, including the wheels. His hands were hard, and the work he turned out, though not equal to that of Ransomes and Sims or Howard of Bedford, was serviceable and good. His income in good years amounted to 800 roubles. Zadik Passil, a man of forty, married, with six children, lived on his land—thirty dessiatines. He uses horses, four or six in the team, which are his own property. Except for the eternal frock coat his bearing was that of a capable small farmer. Zessi Liptaski, twenty-six, bachelor, worked for his father on his allotment. He is one of four brothers who, with the parent, gain a living from the thirty dessiatines. Land is hired on *parole* from a neighbouring proprietor. These men, like their companions, gave one the impression of a natural dignity born of duties done and a consciousness of natural power of mind. The little community is governed by ten old men, with a chairman appointed by Government. They enjoy power to inflict fines up to thirty roubles. There is no crime and no robbery in the village. The policeman was the weakest and most incapable man conceivable, and his physical infirmities formed a silent tribute to the virtues of the people. On my remarking the absence of trees or flowers round the houses, they admitted the defect, but said that for the last few years they were afraid of making improvements which might at any time be confiscated by the Government, but as a matter of fact some of them had begun to plant trees. One excellent feature in Dobraye was the existence of a mutual insurance society, in which no

loss exceeding 400 roubles was recoverable. The average earnings of heads of families amounted to 400 roubles, a very small income for large families. On inquiring into the question of money-lending, I found that, while there were no usurers among the Jewish population, some of the poorest were apt to borrow money at 36 per cent. from a neighbouring Russian peasant, thus giving a Muscovite version of the fable of the wolf and the lamb.

Next day I visited a number of the colonists in their own homes. I paid surprise visits at random, and found the cleanliness and self-respect universal. The Rabbi had great influence, and if ever I saw practical religion carried into daily life it was among those grave and sober Hebrew ploughmen.

Three-furrow ploughs, reapers, rollers of fluted stone, were all made in the place. The blacksmiths and the ploughmen, the miller and the haymakers all exhibited their skill and strength, and I was not surprised to learn from neighbouring proprietors that they prefer Jewish labourers in harvest time to Russians or to Germans. Vodka has no charms for the former.

Space will not allow me to describe the other colonies I visited, where I found results even more favourable to the Jewish population. There is a hunger and thirst for knowledge which is almost pathetic. All the children are educated, and apparently there were no black sheep. It is true that the cultivation is not good to English eyes. Charlock is too plentiful in the young wheat. The potatoes are not "hilled up." The furrows are not straight. Roads are unmended. But the Russian proprietors do no better, if as well, and the

Government studiously neglects this splendid population. Well led and well organised, they are susceptible of great development. To a trained eye, however, their moral and physical condition is full of promise.

In the colony of Novaia Poltavka I found 185 houses, inhabited by 1634 souls in all, cultivating 2850 dessiatines. To the profits of agriculture they added horse breeding. The young men rode like Cossacks of the Don, and on my proposing some races, and offering a few roubles as prizes, there were twenty-eight entries in five minutes. The first race—which we called the Prix du Baron de Hirsch—was most eagerly contested by eight-and-twenty lads, catch weights, riding without saddles or stirrups, and the winner was warmly congratulated on all sides. At last I heard a Russian Jew laugh, and even cheer. For when I left these fine fellows they rode by the side of the cart, and gave me a good salvo of Hebrew cheers, which showed that the gloom and sombre silence of the Jewish population of Russia is removable by sunshine and toil.

# III

# THE JEW IN AUSTRIA

# THE JEW IN AUSTRIA

## I

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY contains more Jews than any other country in Europe, with the exception of Russia.

The total population of the Dual Monarchy amounted in the year 1885 to 41,056,206, of which total 1,648,000 were returned as Jews. In 1895 it had increased to 44,448,474, of which 1,873,000 were Jews. In other words, in the year 1885, out of every 1000 persons 40 were Jews; in the year 1895, out of every 1000 persons 42 were Jews. From these figures we find that the actual increase of Jews in the ten years exceeds their proportionate increase to that of the total population by 88,897.

The foregoing figures, however, by no means represent the total strength of the Hebrew element, for in many parts of the Empire the Jews have become merged in the native population. To take an example: "It is a well-known fact that about 25 per cent. of the Jews in Hungary have gradually become Hungarians, and adopted names of Magyar character; these do not figure in the statistical columns as

Jews at all."* This applies particularly to Budapest.

In the year 1890 there were 118,495 Jews in Vienna out of 1,214,363 inhabitants. In one district of the city —the Leopoldstadt, the "Ghetto" of Vienna—there were 49,098 Jews against 104,934 Roman Catholics. The rapid increase in the number of Jews in the capital is shown by the fact that whereas in the year 1857 there were but 32 Jews for every 1000 inhabitants, the proportion had risen to 122 in 1890. Budapest contains some 150,000 Jews; Prague possesses more than thirty synagogues.

Though there are still many Jews in the wilds of Galicia and Hungary, each year sees a large influx of these to the great cities; it is in the towns that the Hebrew finds the best scope for his undoubted talents.

The proportion of Jews in the Austrian universities is far in excess of what might be expected from their actual numbers in the country. Though they form hardly 5 per cent. of the total population, out of the 15,362 students at Austrian universities in the winter of 1887–88, 19.3 per cent. were Jews. Similarly in the year 1890–91 among the 42,624 boys of the communal schools of Vienna (*Stadtische Volkschulen*) 5600 in round numbers were Jews. On the other hand, of the 6274 pupils at the technical schools (*Gewerbeschulen*), which draw their pupils from the communal schools, only 110 were Jews, a proof of how little they take to the handicrafts as a means of livelihood.

The Jew of Austria-Hungary, like his brethren all

* "The Realm of the Habsburgs," by Sidney Whitman.

the world over, is an adept in the art of "getting on."

"They have certainly all the money, and most of the brains," is a common saying in Austria. "Industry is either in the hands of enterprising scions of the nobility, foreigners (Germans or Englishmen), or Jews," writes Mr. Sidney Whitman in his "Realm of the Habsburgs." But were it not for the kindly assistance of Jewish bankers most of the noble manufacturers could not carry on their business at all.

In fact the Jews are all-powerfully represented in every walk in life that leads to influence and fortune. In the professions of law, medicine, and literature their numbers are out of all proportion to their quota of the population. Finance and commerce are practically in their hands. The great business houses, the banks, the railways that do not belong to the State, are all controlled by them. "The Produce Exchange, and of course the Bourse at Vienna, Prague, or Budapest, are deserted on Jewish holidays."* The press, with the exception of the Czech organs, is almost exclusively in the hands of Jews.

"Have you any Christians on your staff?" Mr. I. Zangwill asked the editor of the great Budapest newspaper, the *Pesther Lloyd*.

"I think we have one," was the editor's reply.†

It says much for the skill with which the Jew caters for the public and for his intellectual abilities in this fact. Every shade of thought in Austria speaks through the mouth, or rather pen, of the Hebrew. In Vienna

* "The Realm of the Habsburgs."

† "Without Prejudice," by I. Zangwill.

newspaper reading is a serious business. Every *café* swarms with eager readers from morning till night. Does the thought ever occur to them that they are held in bondage—intellectual though the bonds may be—by the race that they affect to despise, the hated Jews?

To turn to the Jews in the country districts.

Here the Jews are equally successful in making a livelihood. Mr. Randolph Hodgson, who knows Austria thoroughly—from Tyrol to Hungary, from Bohemia to Dalmatia—declares that he has never seen a poverty-stricken Jew.

On the contrary [he says] it is the native population that is poverty-stricken. And for this the Jews are largely responsible.

Certain writers have endeavoured to show that the Jews are not so unscrupulous as they have been painted. But it is to be feared that these optimists—pleasing though their ideas would be were they but true—have not seen the conditions of village life in Austria-Hungary.

Where there are Jews there is misery; where there are no Jews there is comparative prosperity.

To particularise.

In almost every village in Bohemia one finds a Jew. He keeps the village shop, at which the peasants buy their humble requisites. He also keeps a cheap spirit, which the peasant finds comforting in the cold winter. To a new customer the Jew is ever ready to give "free drinks" and liberal credit; but the victim once in the toils he shows no mercy. It must be the pound of flesh and something over.

Galicia and parts of Hungary contain scores of villages where the peasants' houses are nothing better than hovels, and where the native population are clothed in rags. Above the

dirt and squalor rises a beautiful synagogue, where sleek Jews, in their long gowns and with greasy locks hanging on either side of their grimy faces, gather together on their Sabbath—human leeches nourished in very truth on human blood. Nothing can be bought or sold without the assent of the Jewish "factor"—the people belong body and soul to their Hebrew creditors. Should any Christian have the hardihood to set up in business the Jews combine to ruin him, underselling him until the wretched man is forced to give up in despair. Even a worm will turn, and sometimes the peasants, goaded to madness, rise against their persecutors. When they do so, their vengeance is apt to be summary.

Look at this picture!

It is evening—winter. A tearing wind from the north howls and moans over the Puzsta, driving the snow before it in powdering dust that finds its way into every nook and crevice. A miserable hovel stands by the roadway, its rickety door secured with a massive padlock. The few poor sticks of furniture—even the miserable bed upon which its occupant lay—have been seized by the Jew to whom she is in debt; and the door is closed against her. Food she has none. She is old, friendless, and ill, and has no strength to drag herself to the village. So she sinks down in the snow to die! In the morning she is a frozen corpse.

This is no fancy sketch but a fact. The sequel is still to be told.

The peasants, furious at the man's cruelty, surrounded the Jew's house the next night. Having caught and bound him, they flayed him alive! Then they burnt him to death.

And thus the weary circle of Jewish extortion and Christian revenge is traversed in Austria as in every country where Jews and Gentiles have lived together since the Dispersion.

## II

THERE is only one country in the world where the Jews are hated as much as they are in Austria. And this prejudice exists alike in every branch of society, from the highest to the lowest. All political parties, too, combine in their dislike of the Jews. Thus, though the Judenhetze has been generally associated with the anti-Semitic groups of the German party, we find "Down with the Jews!" as much the watchword of the Czechs in the recent riots as was "Down with the Germans!"

The Austrian nobility is proverbially exclusive. The Jewish millionaire, and, indeed, the parvenu of any nationality, may knock in vain at the door of Austrian "Society." An aristocracy which retains the ideas and traditions of the days of chivalry, which prides itself on its pedigree and sixteen quarterings of noble birth, has still much of the creed of its ancestors of the Crusades, that the bitterest enemies of the Christians are the Jews. An Austrian lady—one of the leaders of Society—on being asked for her opinion of the Jewish Question, writes:

Of course no Jews are received in Society. The only exceptions are the Rothschilds, but even they are never treated as if they were really members of Society. A few years ago

they did not even go to Court, and they have been made to feel again and again that they are on sufferance. Nobody is really intimate with them, and up to now, no young girl of the aristocracy ever dreamed of marrying one of them—even of the richest. The aristocracy of Vienna would never have received Baron Hirsch, and his neighbours did not know him.

A year or so ago there was great excitement in Austrian Society for twenty-four hours. It arose thus. Three Austrian noblemen, of the highest position and rank, were awaiting a summons to the audience chamber of the Emperor. Standing alone in one corner of the ante-room was one of the Baron Rothschilds. The door opened, a chamberlain entered the room, and Prince ——, as first in rank, stepped forward to follow him into the presence of his Majesty. But the official called for Baron Rothschild. "*What?*" exclaimed Prince ——. "You are making a mistake!" he added. "No," replied the man, "I was to ask for Baron Rothschild." So in went the Jew, whilst the three noblemen were left waiting. But "some one had blundered," and next day ample apologies were sent.

The story of Prince F. and the Prince of Wales is well known. The Prince of Wales was invited to shoot with Baron Hirsch, and suggested coming on from St. Johann to Prince F.'s. "I should be glad to receive you on any other occasion," said Prince F., "but not when coming from that Jew's!"

A young Austrian aristocrat was to meet a young Rothschild in England. They had known each other in childhood, and the former's great fear was that the Jew might address him with the familiar "thou" (*du*). "What *shall* I say if he does?" he wailed. But

Rothschild, fortunately for his silly vanity and peace of mind, only spoke in English.

It is among the middle classes that, perhaps, the greatest hatred of the Jew exists. The cause of this may be partially traced to the superior business qualities, and, therefore, corresponding prosperity of the Jews. In other words it is jealousy.

The difference between the Austrian and Jewish tradesmen is most marked. Enter a shop kept by the former, and one comes out disgusted with the off-handedness and incivility one meets with. It is as if the assistant who serves one were conferring a great favour upon his customer. The Jew, on the other hand, is civil and obliging, often obsequious. But this is far preferable to downright rudeness.

In commerce and money-making generally the Jew beats the Austrian all along the line. His strength is the Austrian's weakness. The Jew keeps his object always in view and goes steadily on. The Austrian loses ground through indolent nonchalance.

One sees this weakness in every phase of life in Austria, it seems ingrained in the character of the people. It is enough to walk along the street between eight and ten in the morning. No one is in a hurry. Business will wait! The office will not run away! If you see a man walking fast look well at him—he is a Jew! Lack of energy is the strongest defect in the character of the Austrian. In such an atmosphere of enervation small wonder that the industrious and determined Israelite reaps a rich harvest!

The Austrian revenges himself on the Hebrew by

hatred and abuse. He perceives that he is hopelessly out-distanced, but he cannot or will not see the real cause. The Jew is *ein Streber*, he says ; an unscrupulous "striver," a cheating trickster, a man who will use any means, foul or fair, to "get on." All this must be taken with a grain of salt, however. It is even doubtful whether—in the towns at least—the Jew is more grasping than the Christian. Both are animated with the same natural desire to succeed ; but the Jew has both the will and the energy to follow up his object in life.

To gauge the feelings of the native peasantry towards the Jews is a matter of difficulty, since it is impossible to be precise in generalities. Some 65 per cent. of the total population of Austria-Hungary may be considered as dependant upon the cultivation of the soil. This enormous number is made up of so many various nationalities, and their occupation is carried on under such varying conditions, that what applies to one race or country is totally inapplicable to another. Townspeople have thoughts and ideas in common all the world over : it is in the country that one finds the social chacteristics fully developed.

Probably, throughout Austria-Hungary there exists a certain antipathy among the peasants towards the Jews. But in some parts of the Dual Monarchy (*e.g.*, Tyrol to Salzburg) one finds few or no Jews, and in these districts the feeling is merely a passive sentiment. Bohemia, Hungary, and Galicia are the countries where the Jew is most in evidence in village life. This fact rather tends to imply that the Slav and Magyar form a more easy prey to the Jewish harpy than the more thrifty German stock. Anti-Semitism in Galicia, however, is notoriously prevalent.

## III

"DIE Judenfrage in Oesterreich" ("The Jewish Question in Austria"), a pamphlet by Ernst Vergani, editor of the Vienna newspaper *Deutschen Volksblattes*, gives some statistics with regard to the number of Jews in Hungary and Galicia.

In Hungary there were, under Joseph II., 25,000 Jews; at the end of the last century there were 50,000; in 1830, 100,000; in 1847, 270,000; in 1870, 500,000; in 1883, 700,000; whilst at the present time the number has reached 1,000,000.*

In Galicia the Jews have not diminished in numbers, in spite of the fact that many annually leave the country. On the contrary, they have increased in the last twenty years 34 per cent. In Silesia they have increased 64 per cent. in the same time; and in the Bukowina 74 per cent. The Jews now form 11.7 per cent. of the population of Galicia, 12.8 per cent. of

* The same pamphlet gives the number of Jews in Austria as 1,143,305. Thus the total number of Jews in Austria-Hungary, according to these figures, amounts to 2,143,305. The figures already given (1,872,000) are taken from Whitaker's Almanac for 1898.

It is probable that the official census of Jews in Austria greatly underrates the actual number.

the inhabitants of the Bukowina, and 16 per cent. of the population of Silesia.

A fifth part of the land in Galicia belongs to Jews. In the Bukowina 22 per cent. of the great landed proprietors are Jews, and the remaining landed property is mostly involved in debt to the Jews.

The Budapest University numbered 3679 students in 1888–1889; 1194 were Jews. A third of the professors are of Jewish origin. The Budapest Polytechnic in 1888–89 had 578 scholars, of whom 201 were Jews, the Commerce Academy (*Handelsakedemie*) 599 scholars, of whom 480 were Jews. In the Gymnasium and Practical Schools (*Realschulen*) of Hungary 20 per cent. were Jews, though but 4.5 per cent. of the population were Jews.

## IV

THE peasantry of Austria-Hungary up to 1848 were little better than serfs; and the freedom that they now enjoy has placed them, in many parts of the Empire, in a worse position than they were in before. As the goods and chattels of a powerful territorial nobleman they were able to look to their master at all times, to rely upon an even-handed, if somewhat rough, sense of justice. The patriarchal instinct exists, even now, to some extent, and certain great landowners still take a kind-hearted and almost fatherly interest in the well-being of the humble tillers of the soil. But, in some districts, the yoke of slavery has fallen from the neck of the peasant only to be more firmly fixed there by the hands of the Jew. Education has yet to spread, the lessons of thrift and self-help have still to be learnt, and till these follow in the steps of their newly-gained liberty the peasants may groan in vain beneath the relentless greed of their Hebrew creditors.

Bohemia is the richest and most fertile of the many countries that form the Austrian Empire. Here the ordinary wages of an agricultural labourer amount to 60 kreutzer (1s.) a day, whilst the daily wage for female

field-labour is *6d.* Winter, with its deep pall of snow and biting frost, often throws the Bohemian out of work for months together, and during this time the necessities of life must be obtained on credit from the Jew shopkeeper, since no Czech peasant was ever known to lay by even the smallest trifle for the proverbial rainy day. This accommodation has to be dearly paid for the next summer. Thus the burden of debt goes on from year to year. Pinching poverty, rags, and dirt, if not absolute ruin and starvation, form the lot of but too many of the Bohemian peasantry. Austrians allege that there is much of the bully in the nature of the Hebrew. To the more prosperous classes he cringes, to the poverty-stricken peasants he is inexorable as Fate.

On the wall of a certain Bohemian castle there hangs the portrait of its builder, a boy count of the seventeenth century. When a mere child he thrashed a young Jew of about his own age. The Jews complained to the young count's parents, and the boy was severely punished. Then and there he swore that when he came to man's estate he would drive all the Jews from his possessions. This resolve he faithfully kept, and, as his successors followed his example, until the year '48, when the Revolution swept away most of the privileges and power of the aristocracy, no Jew was to be found on a property that embraced the greater portion of Northern Bohemia. The peasants in that part of the country still speak regretfully of those pre-'48 days, when their "worst enemies," the Jews, were not!

## ADDITIONAL STATISTICS

from "Die Judenfrage in Oesterreich."

Jews in Austria at various times (exclusive of Hungary).

| | |
|---|---|
| Maria Theresa's reign | 200,000 |
| 1830 | 355,000 |
| 1850 | 476,000 |
| 1869 | 822,000 |
| 1880 | 1,000,000 |
| 1890 | 1,143,305 |

In Vienna *one person in ten* is a Jew.

In the Vienna University in 1887–88 out of 6350 students there were 2500 Jews—*i.e.*, 40 per cent. In the various schools, &c., of Vienna the percentage of Jews in 1887–88 was as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Technical School (*Technik*) | 27 |
| Commerce Academy (*Handelsakademie*) | 24 |
| Practical Schools (*Realschulen*) | 26 |
| Practical Gymnasium (*Realgymnasien*) | 48 |
| Gymnasien | 29 |
| National and Town Schools (*Volks und Bürgerschulen*) | 13 |

In all the Austrian Gymnasien and Practical Schools of that year they formed 18.5 per cent. In the Middle Class Schools (*Mittelschule*) only 22 per cent. were Christians and 77 per cent. Jews. Of 280 teachers in the Vienna University in 1888 about 30 per cent. were of Jewish origin.

At the end of 1887 out of 660 qualified attorneys in Vienna 350 were Jews, and out of 360 attorney-"candidates" (*candidaten*) 310 were Jews. At the end of 1889, of 999 members of the Vienna Stock Exchange elected by vote, 883 were Jews. Of the Vienna houses of the old parish district 40 per cent. are directly (reckoning the mortgages 70 per cent.) the property

of Jews. Since 1867, 1000 Jews have, on the average, annually changed their Polish-Jewish names to Magyar names. Of military doctors in 1877, 7 per cent. were Jews; in 1889, 23 per cent.;* whilst of the new doctors entering in 1889, 39 per cent.

* Two hundred and fifteen out of 930.

## V

## THE ANTI-SEMITIC MOVEMENT

THE financial revival which followed the Franco-German war of 1870 threw the Jewish element into marked relief, and gave rise to a protest against the sordid and realistic tendencies of the time which gradually fastened on the Jews. People began to denounce them as the chief demoralising force at work in the transformation of society. The idea was, of course, a grotesque exaggeration, but it found considerable support, partly because it had a large body of latent prejudice to appeal to, and partly because it was a convenient safety-valve for agitators who were discontented with the whole social fabric. Thus the new anti-Semitic movement was founded.*

Such is Mr. Lucien Wolf's account of the origin of a movement which has made no greater progress in the countries of Europe than in Austria.

At the present time there are two parties in Austria which designate themselves as anti-Semites : the Christian Socialists, with Dr. Lueger at their head, and the Clerical Germans. With regard to the Jews, however, their tenets are practically identical, so it is more con-

* "The Jewish Year Book," 1897–98, pp. 334, 335.

venient to class both parties under the general title of anti-Semites.

Dr. Lueger, formerly Bürgermeister of Vienna, is a man of great personal charm. He has been idolised by the Viennese, and is, without doubt, thoroughly honest in his convictions. But he is an idealist, and (like most Austrians) lacking in business qualities. By no means a rich man, he is now in great straits financially. His salary as Bürgermeister amounted to only £1600 a year (20,000 florins), with an addition of £350 (4000 florins) to defray the expense of a carriage. Thus it is difficult for him to withstand the financial war that the Jews are waging against him.

It is impossible to trace the various steps in the dealings of the Emperor with Lueger, since the true feelings of the Emperor were not, and are not, known. Lueger was repeatedly elected Bürgermeister in 1896. His election was refused by the Emperor, and Herr Strobach was ultimately elected (May 6). In 1897 the same events were repeated. At length, however, Lueger's election was confirmed.

This may be safely said. The Emperor is a thoroughly broad-minded man, who, though he might respect the zeal of an honest reformer, would not willingly see a one-sided bigot raised to the position of Bürgermeister. When thoroughly assured of the wish of the majority—perhaps advised that, besides his own personal popularity, the stability of the Throne was at stake—he yielded. There is little doubt that the Emperor, as a statesman and a Christian, personally disapproves of the anti-Semitic movement. The Arch-

duke Franz Ferdinand, the heir to the crown, is believed to encourage it.

The movement finds most favour among the younger members of society. Indeed, the students may be said to form its backbone.

The anti-Semites deny that they attack the Jewish religion. It is against the Semites that their efforts are directed, they say—against the race, not the religion. They even affirm that the Jewish persecutions of the Middle Ages were political rather than religious.

The cause of the people's fury against the Jews in the Middle Ages, as at all times, was the unlawful usury and the profit made from all classes of people by Jewish intrigue and cunning. Numerous grievances were at that time addressed by the citizens of various towns to the Government, and the outcry of the present day shows it clearly. Only in those days people were not clear about this—that in the Jews they had to deal with a foreign nation and a foreign race, and therefore religion had to be used as a characteristic.*

What the anti-Semites are really aiming at may be best given in their own words.

They want to see the Jewish influx in various districts limited by lawful means, because they feel it to be hurtful. They try, therefore, to obtain a revision of the law, by which the Jews should experience certain restrictions. Further, they wish, first of all, to work upon the true nature of Judaism, warning against the busy cunning and intrigue of former days, and supporting all reform which would contribute to the moral, intellectual, and economical well-being of our nation.†

* "Antisemiten-Katechismus," von Theodor Fritsch.
† *Ibid.*

The Austro-Hungarian anti-Semites' case against the Jews is as follows :

The Jews under the mantle of "religion" form in reality a political, social, and commercial company, which, guided by the same principles and with secret understanding between themselves, aims at the subjugation of, and profiting by, non-Jewish people. The Jews of all countries and all languages are in this aim one, and work for its accomplishment unanimously. Therefore it is impossible for the Jews in the country where they happen to dwell ever to take an honest interest in the lot of their non-Jewish compatriots. In short, a Jew can never cherish an honest patriotism : he is ever, and before all, conscious of being a member of the 'chosen' Jewish nation; and if he poses as German, French, or English it is at most a well calculated hypocrisy. In his peculiar community the Jew looks upon all Gentiles as his enemies, whom he has to combat with cunning and treachery. By his peculiar moral law the Jew considers himself above all other codes, and holds himself prepared to transgress all laws of the land, but ever in such a manner that the abuse cannot be brought home to him. The Jews consider themselves in their blindness the "natural aristocracy" of mankind, and believe on this ground that they should be masters of the world. This position they seek, not by deeds of bravery or superior energy, but by craft and fraud and money. . . .

By the practice of usury they have completely ruined many peasants, tradesmen, clerks, officers, and others, and brought about not only their material but their moral ruin.

They have by dishonourable means and secret co-operation so undermined established trades and industries, and have got so many branches of business into their own hands, that honest non-Jewish tradesmen can scarcely remain in them any longer.

They have so completely annihilated honest handiwork that the heretofore independent master has become to-day the hired slave of the Jewish shopkeeper, for whom he works at starvation wages.

They have so lowered the labour-wage and the price of all produce that it has become impossible for any one to make a living by honest work. Social misery and social discontent by this means become ever greater and the danger of a blood-thirsty uprising draws ever nearer.

"They have obtained possession of the public press and use it for their own purposes—to deceive the people as to the real motive of this general state of distress, and to turn off this discontent in a false direction (to the Government, clergy, nobility, police, &c.). By this also they stir up, through undermining all authority, social revolution, whilst they cunningly think to keep themselves in the shade.

They wrong by their command of money and unconscionable greed the social *verlodderung* in every respect. Everything they make purchasable—office, tithes, names, honours, &c. They are besides, among the female growth of our people, the cause of unheard-of moral ruin. The base sensual nature of the Jews and their want of shame and conscience make them the most audacious corruptors. Girls who in large towns enter into menial situations mostly fall in moral ruin. One would scarcely assert too much if one said that the majority of unfortunate girls who form the prostitutes of the larger towns have fallen through Jewish depravity: also that the notorious "girl commerce" will soon be carried on exclusively by the Jews.*

These sweeping charges, exaggerated as they are, yet contain more than a modicum of truth.

Major Osman Bey reports in his book, "The Con-

* "Antisemiten-Katechismus."

quest of the World by the Jews," how a prominent Jew, at a gathering of the Jewish elders at Cracow, in the year 1840, said: "So long as we do not have the newspapers of the whole world in our hands to deceive and blind the people our mastery remains a chimera."*

When, in the year 1852, the Jew Crémieux (he who, in 1870, set a price on the German Emperor's head, and whose death is celebrated in the Jewish synagogues of Germany) issued a summons to the founding of "The Israelitish Alliance," he called it in these words:

> Our nationality is the religion of our fathers—we know no other. The Jewish doctrine must one day fill the whole world. Success is certain. Every day will the net which Israel casts over the world spread itself. Let us make use of all opportunities—our power is great, let us learn to employ it. What have we to fear? The day is not far off when the wealth of the world will belong exclusively to the Jews.†

The prophecy of Crémieux appears to be well on its way to fulfilment as far as the Dual Empire is concerned.

That the Austrian opinion holds that the Jews do constitute a real danger to Austria needs little demonstration. The following quotation from a Berlin paper may be cited as a fair example:

> To put the case. France thinks the proper time has come to declare war with Germany. So it rests in the powerful hands of Rothschild to drive our ally Austria to instant bankruptcy and financial ruin if she does not submit to Rothschild's political dictates. To bring about such a catastrophe nothing

* "Antisemiten-Katechismus."

† "Die Judenfrage in Oesterreich."

more is wanted than to throw Rothschild's holding of Austrian stocks suddenly on the market, to lower them 500, half, or even less, and to add a couple of hundred million Austrian and Hungarian Rentes. Now one can see the effect of such a highly simple operation. Then follow immediately the untold thousand millions in other Rentes, stocks, industries, mortgages, &c., and the war-whoops and fury of the shattered counterplots accomplish the rest. We have allowed things with these Government funds and influence to go much too far. We have already long ago called attention to these specially fabricated Rothschild weapons, and, somewhat too late, it is patent to every one on what a dangerous mine Europe is standing, and in whose hand is the match for kindling it.*

When one finds the wealth, the commerce, the industry of a nation in the hands of a foreign antipathetic race, it augurs ill for the future of that country, and speaks badly for the resisting power of its people. The danger lies not so much in the successes of the Jews, as in the failure of the native population to hold their own. It is not as if Jew and Austrian started level, with a fair field and no favour; the Jew has the concentrated hatred and prejudice of centuries against him and yet he succeeds! "Only a dead nation is afraid of foreigners," writes Mr. Zangwill. But Austria is worse than dead, she is a house divided against itself—a conglomeration of races fighting one against another, with no united national feelings. Hungary, on the other hand, is a nation in the true sense of the word—brimful of patriotic sentiment, and almost bursting with the sense of her own importance. When a

* "Die Judenfrage in Oesterreich."

Hungarian magnate was told that an English nobleman was yachting in the Mediterranean, he gravely made the remark: "Why there? He should come to the Platten See!" That is the spirit of the Hungarians—Hungary first, the rest of the world nowhere. It is this sentiment that is enabling Hungary to absorb the Jewish element, especially in the capital. The Jew of Budapest is as ardent a Hungarian as the Magyar, and he changes his Semitic name to a Magyar one in consequence. There is nothing of this sort in Vienna. The Jews are looked upon as enemies and treated as such—forced back upon their own nationality as it were. The Jew conceals his feelings, and laughs in his sleeve, for he knows that these simple Viennese cannot do without him. He is their banker, their doctor, their dentist, their lawyer; he rules their money market; he directs their industries; and he writes their newspapers for them wherein he abuses himself. But by all this he makes his fortune, so what matters a little abuse? The anti-Semite may whine and rage, and talk of "bloody upheavals"; but the Jew knows better. Such things may happen in Paris, but they will not take place in gay, pleasure-loving Vienna.

There is a strange compound of Social Democracy and the priestly power of Rome in anti-Semitism. The Socialist sees an immense pile of wealth, some of which may fall to his share if he can but destroy the Jewish owners thereof; the priest would divert some of it to the coffers of the Holy Church; he whispers insidiously into the ear of the anti-Semite his blessing on the destruction of the unbelievers, whilst he himself remains discreetly hidden.

The anti-Semites have formed no plans or ideas as to what will become of the Jews should their hopes succeed.

That is not our concern, they say. The Jew who has robbed the peasant of his shirt and turned him out of house and home does not ask what will become of the peasant. He turns him on the highway and does not concern himself about him—whether he starves, becomes a thief, or takes his own life rather than die in a mad-house. He insists upon his "bond," claims "his just right" to the letter, and thinks himself exempted from all duties towards his fellow-men.*

To which argument the Jew may justly reply *tu quoque.*

At the same time the constant impoverishment of the native population is manifest to all, and that something must be done, and done quickly, to prevent the peasantry in certain districts from being brought to absolute beggary is very evident.

The anti-Semites of Austria-Hungary have manifestly taken the wrong turn. Had they attempted to fight the Jews on their own ground, to rouse a spirit of emulation and energy among their own people, to inculcate the principles of thrift and self-help among the peasantry, and raise them from the slough of despond into which they have in many districts fallen, they would at least have deserved well of their country.

At present the Jew is the victor, and until Europe as a whole deals with the Jewish Question in a spirit of constructive statesmanship, the problem in Austria-

* "Antisemiten-Katechismus."

Hungary is unlikely to be solved by the deposition of the Jew from the place he has legally won for himself under competitive conditions.

But the trouble grows as the years roll by, and the time is not far distant when Jewish ascendency in Austria will bring new forces of resistance into being.

# IV

# THE JEW IN AMERICA

# THE JEW IN AMERICA

AFTER the King of Portugal's two Commissions of Inquiry had decided against the acceptance of Columbus' offers (1484) Columbus found his way to Seville and prevailed upon the Duke of Medina Celi to fit out an expedition for him. Before the preparations were finished (probably in the late autumn of 1585) the Duke sent an account of Columbus' project to Cardinal Mendoza, the Prime Minister, and asked him to obtain the King's and Queen's consent to the expedition. Further particulars were requested and furnished by the Duke; and he was then requested to send Columbus himself to Court (January 1586) and informed that if the affair were taken in hand at all it must be on account of the Crown, the Duke being promised a share in the proceeds if it were successful. Columbus arrived at Cordova on January 20, 1586. (Las Casas is wrong when he says 1585.) Las Casas says:

> There [that is, at Cordova] he with his amiability made friends with persons who thought well of his project. Amongst these was Luis de San Angel, an Aragonese gentleman, Clerk of the Ration of the Royal Household, a person of great wisdom and capacity, who took up the project warmly. He it

was who spoke to the King about it, and urged him to allow the admiral to demonstrate to him the possibility of his plans.

This Aragonese noble—who was Treasurer of the Household, and also Finance Minister when Ferdinand was absent from Aragon—was of Jewish blood.*

Columbus had been waiting in Cordova from January until May 1586 before he could gain an audience (the King being away at the wars most of the time) and the Jewish treasurer it was who at length obtained for him admission to the sovereigns. The matter was referred to a commission which derided and rejected the plans of Columbus, and for a time they fell through. Through the next three years, although the country was desolated with war in every part, and the King and Queen constantly on the move, Columbus' friends, amongst whom the most active were San Angel and another Aragonese noble of Jewish blood, named Gabriel Sanchez, High Treasurer of Aragon, were urging Ferdinand and Isabella to take up the project. Columbus again saw the sovereigns before Granada some time late in 1591, but money was short, his demands were preposterous, and, as it turned out, impossible of fulfilment. Once again he failed to persuade Ferdinand, although Isabel, thinking of the religious aspect, was more sympathetic. Columbus left the Court (at Santa Fé) and was on his way home heart-broken, when a messenger summoned him to return. This is what Las Casas says about this turning point of the plan when Columbus had been finally dismissed :

* Father Mir's "Influencia de las Aragonese en el discuvrimento de America."

Amongst those who had helped him was Luis de San Angel, who was as deeply grieved at this second and final repulse as if he himself had been deeply concerned therein and his life depended upon it. Unable to bear the thought of the loss they would suffer if any other prince carried Columbus' plans to a successful issue, trusting in God and his influence with the sovereigns, he (San Angel) went to the Queen.

(Here Las Casas gives a long speech delivered by San Angel to the Queen fervently begging her to allow him to recall Columbus, which Isabel at last consented to do.)

After infinite negotiation and unheard-of demands by Columbus the agreement was finally signed (April 1592). The exchequer of Castile was nearly empty, and the matter would have again fallen through but for the Jews, San Angel and Sanchez. Columbus' son, Hernando, in the "Life of the Admiral," says: "San Angel told the Queen that it would be but a small service he would do the King and her in lending her the million *maravedis* necessary." Oviedo, in his "History of the Indies," says: "And as there was a lack of money for the expedition in consequence of the war, the funds were lent by Luis de San Angel, the Clerk of the Rations." Other contemporaries confirm this, although the Aragonese writers try to make out that San Angel did not lend the money out of his own pocket, but out of the Aragonese treasury. Certain it is in any case that San Angel received the money he lent from another Jewish noble, Gabriel Sanchez, the High Treasurer of Aragon, but whether it was national money or his own is not clear. There

is at Simancas an account-book of San Angel's which seems to me to prove that San Angel actually lent the money out of his own pocket, and was promptly repaid by Sanchez out of the Aragonese treasury, a view confirmed by another account-book, also at Simancas, in which there is an entry under May 5, 1592:

> Paid to Luis de San Angel . . . 2,640,000 *maravedis*, of which 1,500,000 is to be paid Isaac Abraham for his loan to their Highnesses for expenses of the war and for the amount he lent to pay for the caravels sent to the Indies and for Christopher Columbus who goes in the expedition.

The first letters written by Columbus giving an account of his discovery were addressed in duplicate to Gabriel Sanchez and Luis de San Angel. The letter was written by Columbus as soon as he landed in Lisbon from his first voyage, and has been translated into every language.

It will thus be seen that even in Spain in the fifteenth century nothing could be done without a Jew intermediary. This point about America, so far as I know, has never yet been mentioned by any one.

Both San Angel and Sanchez were unquestionably of Jewish blood, and it will be remarked that they both had to do with finance.

It is interesting to note that the cruelty of Spain and the Dominicans towards the Jews in the fifteenth century enlisted the sympathies of pious Jews throughout the civilised world with the United States in the recent Spanish-American war. They remembered how, in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, a house was sold for an ass and a vineyard for a few yards of cloth when

the Jews were expelled from Spain. They recalled how the Jews, under pretence of being shipped to some foreign part, were taken out to sea and drowned in cold blood. Jews have long memories, and as a race are not unjust. The capture and destruction of the Spanish fleet appealed to their historical imagination, and satisfied them that though the mills of God grind slowly the ruin of Spain was an equitable adjustment of her debt to the Jews.

The Sephardim, who alone suffered from the murderous tyranny of the Inquisition, were not singular in shouting their joy at the approaching downfall of Spain. Other classes of Jews caught the enthusiasm of the hour. Deep down in their hearts was nourished a lingering, if passive, enmity to Spain for what she had done to their ancestors.

# V

# THE JEW IN FRANCE

# THE JEW IN FRANCE

THE lot of the Jews in France was, if anything, worse than that of their co-religionists across the Channel. Their sojourn in that country was a constant succession of persecutions, banishments, and returns. We find the French kings banishing the Jews from their dominions, only to recall them a few years later to provide the money necessary for the administration of Government or for a Crusade. Philip Augustus, Louis IX., and Philip the Fair, after expelling the race, were obliged to welcome them back. Without the Jews, the French monarchy would have become bankrupt. The poverty of the early Capets, and to a certain extent also of the House of Valois, was owing to the fact that the monarchy was surrounded by powerful vassals, each one of whom was little inferior in power to the king himself, who defied the latter when it suited his pleasure, and who collected the taxes of his county or dukedom and coined money with as much freedom as did the king at Paris. There were many periods in the history of mediæval France when a duke of Normandy or a count of Flanders or a duke of Burgundy eclipsed his sovereign in resources and military strength. Such being the case French kings

had not at their disposal the resources of their country as had the kings of England. The strong rule of the Conqueror and his sons had set limits to the power of feudalism, which the early Capets were too weak to restrain, and had thus secured to their successors a compact well-ordered kingdom prepared to second with its resources the sovereign when he went to war. The hand of the Angevin and Plantagenet was felt in Wales and on the Scottish marches as the hand of the Capet was never felt in Flanders or in Aquitaine. Thus the Jews were the only ready source of money available to the central government. Philip Augustus is said to have used them as a sponge to suck up the money of his subjects and to have squeezed them of every farthing they possessed after completion of the absorbing process.

The causes of Jewish unpopularity in France seem to have been much the same as those which influenced their expulsion from England. They were the bankers, the money lenders, the sharp business men. In the reign of Philip Augustus they were possessed of extensive landed property, a form of wealth, however, which they did not long retain, as popular discontent compelled the king to prohibit the tenure of land by Jews.

Surprising as is the hardihood in the endurance of persecution of the Jewish race in England, much more extraordinary is the same phenomenon in France. Persecutions and massacres came thick and fast upon the unfortunate race. They were expelled from the country. They were deprived of liberty. They were despoiled of their riches. Notwithstanding these dis-

advantages, which would have destroyed a race possessed of less vitality than the Hebrews, they are mentioned by historians as enjoying prosperity at many periods. Thus in the thirteenth century the Jews of Languedoc had in their possession many hundreds of Christian slaves.* No doubt the arrogance of the Hebrew when he ceases for a moment to undergo the chastening influence of persecution had excited the antipathy of the Government, for the same century witnessed the issue of an edict forbidding the Jews to oppress their Christian debtors and compelling them to give up their Christian slaves.

Religious fanaticism played a more important part than in England as a cause of hatred towards Jews. No country was so deeply imbued with the crusading fever as was France; no country sent forth so many of her sons to die in the deserts of Palestine. Rich and poor, noble and peasant, men of every age and of every degree, flocked to market place and cathedral in order to hear the story of sufferings undergone by the followers of Christ in the Holy City, and to take the vow which bound them to set out eastward to rescue the Sepulchre of our Lord from the hands of the infidel. The host of mail-clad knights who followed Godfrey de Bouillon and Philip Augustus to Syria were enabled to perform their vow, as far as warfare with the Moslem was concerned. Not so, however, with the swarm of labourers and peasants who had forsaken vineyard and plough's tail at the bidding of the clergy, and who were massed together with the vague object of marching against Saladin. Their

* Slave dealing was a favourite trade of the Jews in the Dark Ages.

poverty and lack of organisation prevented them from becoming anything but a scourge to the countryside. Papal authority was powerless in dealing with them. Too often their enthusiasm for warfare against the infidel was diverted into the channel of a massacre of Jews. The old, old story was repeated in all its sickening detail of cant and intolerance. It was the Jewish race, they argued, who crucified the Redeemer, and it would be doing God service to revenge the death of His Son even as their lords were doing Him service in warring against the Turk in far-off Asia. Besides these pious motives, cupidity and ignorant suspicion played an important part in influencing the action of these peasant fanatics. A well-known instance of this class of Jewish massacre is found in the reign of St. Louis, when a band of peasantry collected for the purpose of rescuing the king from his captivity in Egypt fell on the Jews and plundered their property. The above case is one of a hundred.

It may be observed that the tendency of the Government was more inclined to lenity in treatment of the Jews than was that of the lower classes. The ruined shopkeeper of Orleans or Rouen had experience of the merciless behaviour of Jewish creditors to the unfortunates who fell into their clutches. Thus when the cry "Down with the Jews!" was heard at the street corners no one was quicker in snatching up his arms, or was more bloodthirsty in the massacre, than debtors of the citizen or peasant class. On the other hand, the king and his advisers had no personal experience of Jewish usury. To them the race was the source from which they could obtain money. There was none of

the furious hatred with which Jews were regarded by the inferior classes.

Ignorance, superstition, and credulity were causes of Jewish massacres in France, as they were in England. The wildest rumours found credence among a people debased in the deepest abyss of ignorance. Thus the statement that the Jews were responsible for a pestilence which swept over France in 1348 caused a massacre of the unfortunate race by the credulous serfs.

Charges of poisoning wells and of crucifying Christian children were circulated alike in France and England.

At the end of the fourteenth century a final edict, that of Charles VI., banished the Jews from French soil. Until the monarchy had passed away, and until France was labouring in the travail of her Revolution, the Hebrew race were strangers within her territory.

Buonaparte desired to better the position of the Jews. If France has forfeited in the latter portion of the century the esteem and respect of humanity after the terrible perfidy, duplicity, and moral degradation exhibited by the staff of the army, by the judges, by the Government and the people of France, it must never be forgotten that the modern toleration of the Chosen People began in France. It is alleged that Napoleon, by summoning a grand Sanhedrin of the Jews, contemplated both commercial and military advantages. He is said to have hoped to turn to his own advantage the wonderful system of information possessed by the Jews which enabled them not only to command the supply of the

precious metals, but also to control much of the internal traffic of Europe in spite of the Continental system which was then in full force. The opinion of Dean Milman that the reconstruction of the kingdom of Poland and the help that the Jews might be in accomplishing that object was also one of the considerations that affected the mind of Napoleon. However this may be, and whatever the Napoleonic motives were, the fact remains that to France and France alone is due the large toleration towards the Jews in which she was the European pioneer. What is not so well known, however, is that before Napoleon ameliorated the condition of the Jews in France and gave them equal citizenship he invited replies to twelve questions. I subjoin the questions and the answers, which are placed together for the sake of conciseness. They were as follows:

I. Is polygamy allowed among the Jews?

Polygamy is forbidden, according to a decree of the Synod of Worms, in 1030.

II. Is divorce recognised by the Jewish law?

Divorce is allowed, but in this respect the Jews recognise the authority of the civil law of the land in which they live.

III. Can Jews intermarry with Christians?

Intermarriages with Christians are not forbidden, though difficulties arise from the different forms of marriage.

IV. Will the French people be esteemed by the Jews as strangers or as brethren?

The Jews of France recognise in the fullest sense the French people as their brethren

V. In what relation, according to the Jewish law, would the Jews stand towards the French?

The relation of the Jew to the Frenchman is the same as of Jew to Jew. The only distinction is in their religion.

VI. Do Jews born in France consider it their native country? Are they bound to obey the laws and customs of the land?

The Jews acknowledged France as their country when oppressed—how much more must they when admitted to civil rights!

VII. Who elect the Rabbins.

The election of the Rabbins is neither defined nor uniform. It usually rests with the heads of each family in the community.

VIII. What are the legal powers of the Rabbins?

The Rabbins have no judicial power; the Sanhedrin is the only legal tribunal. The Jews of France and Italy being subject to the equal laws of the land, whatever power they might otherwise exercise is annulled.

IX. Are the election and authority of the Rabbins grounded on law or custom?

The election and powers of the Rabbins rest solely on usage.

X. Is there any kind of business in which the Jews may not be engaged?

All business is permitted to the Jews.

XI. Is usury to their brethren forbidden by the Law?

The Mosiac institute forbids unlawful interest; but this was the law of an agricultural people.

XII. Is it permitted or forbidden to practise usury with strangers?

The Talmud allows legal interest to be taken from brethren and strangers; it forbids usury.

No impartial mind examining the answers given by the Jews to the questions of Napoleon, on reviewing the history of the last ninety-three years, is able to aver that the Jews as a whole have kept their side of the bargain. The Reinach scandals, the disasters of Panama, bribed deputies, general aloofness, and inveterate money-lending are recorded against them, and however despicable and unthinking French anti-Semitism has become, it cannot be truthfully alleged that there is no ground for resentment at the manner in which French hospitality has been used by the Jews. But it must be remarked that in France, as in England, Austria, and Russia, the evil that has been done is not the work of the religious Jew; it is wrought by the Jew who, while refusing to accept the burdens of citizenship along with its rights, has renounced his faith in favour of a materialism which has always excited the ungovernable passions of the European peoples, and will doubtless continue to excite them whenever the evils reach such a point as to be intolerable.

The attitude of the French Jews towards the Franco-Russian Alliance was frankly described by the organ of the Jewish community, *Darkest Russia*, to which previous allusion has been made. It was declared authoritatively by this organ on February 12, 1892, that

> the Russian loan was coldly met by French investors, and the scanty measure of support that it received was obtained under pressure of the most influential kind on a small number of very large capitalists and credit societies, whose honesty may be gauged by the false statement they published to the world that the loan was covered seven times over.

Since these very large capitalists and credit societies were almost exclusively Jewish, it is evident that the subscription to the Russian loan of 1892 was the turning point in the history of modern Judaism, so far as it is affected by the policy of France and Russia, and it is idle to pretend after this admission by the authoritative and well-informed organ of Jewish opinion that the loan to Russia could not have been refused had the pity and humanity of the great banking money-lenders risen superior to their desire for profit. It has been alleged that, if the Jews had remained aloof, the French public would have subscribed the loan over and over again and that no good would have resulted from Jewish abstention. But here we have a definite statement on the part of the most responsible, well-informed, and humane portion of the Jewish community to the effect that the Russian loan was obtained only under pressure of the most influential kind from "very large capitalists and credit societies," who are roundly charged by their co-religionists with dishonesty for publishing the false statement that the loan was covered seven times over.

When the terrible collapse of French justice and humanity, as displayed in the history of the now historic Dreyfus case, is considered, the action of a portion of the French-Jewish community must not be forgotten. The Panama scandal, the disgrace of Reinach and other prominent Jews, stimulated the anti-Semitic movement and encouraged its main supporters, in a way which even in 1892 was not anticipated by the most far-seeing of Jewish writers. It is true that many of the great families in France are connected by marriage with the

Jewish race. For instance, the Prince de Wagram married a Miss Rothschild, and the Prince de Ligne another; while the Duchesse de Gramont was also a Miss Rothschild. One of the Furtado-Heines married the Duc de Rivoli, another Prince Murat. The Duchesse de Richelieu and the Duchesse d'Elchingen also belonged to the family of the Heines. The two heiresses of old M. Cohen of Antwerp married the Marquis de Tailly and the Prince de Lucinge Faucigny respectively. The Oppenheimers also married their daughters to sprigs of the aristocracy. The Duchesse de Castries was a Miss Sina, as was also the Comtesse d'Harcourt. Miss Haber married the Marquis de Grouchy, Miss Lowenheim bears the old name of Duchesse de Fitz-James, and Miss Mires is now Princesse de Polignac, while many others, too numerous to mention, have married well-known French noblemen.

It would be a mistake, therefore, to consider that the Catholic and military influence was entirely unanimous against the Jews. Such strength, however, as the Dreyfusard side received from the great families was surreptitious and never was allowed to leak out.

The Jews, however, were naturally unfriendly to the Franco-Russian alliance. It was pointed out to them that, on the political side, France had consistently been the foe of Russia. It was no accidental combination that brought England and France together in the Crimea. It was not merely the memory of ancient wars which France had waged against the Empire of the North. Old-time enmities no doubt there are to warn the French against accepting the Russian's

proffered friendship with alacrity. The Silesian wars, the terrible disaster at Moscow, the fact that Russia at the time of the Revolution consituted itself the patron of the exiled royalties of France, would perhaps fade away from the thoughts of a generous nation ; but France can never forget that she stood forth in the past as the champion of Polish liberty, and resisted the partition of Poland in 1772. As I have attempted to show in the chapter on Russian Jews that the criminal tri-partite partition of Poland is the origin of Russian-Jewish troubles, it is instructive to remark that it was only when France condoned the action of Russia in that historic event, that the case of the Jews in Europe acquired its present grimly miserable condition, and that the Government of France sank to the lowest depths of moral degradation ever reached by a Great Power.

Writing on this subject on February 12, 1892, *Darkest Russia*, the authoritative organ of that portion of the Jewish community which was really hostile to the Russian persecutions, spoke out as follows :

Least of all can France bear a helping hand to an organised religious persecution. Tolerance is the keynote of modern civilisation, and this note has been sounded more clearly and frequently by France than by any other nation of Europe, our own excepted. If France can claim to have practised the doctrines that she preached, if France would point to the clinching proof that she maintained indeed the principles to which she gave verbal utterance, then she may well ask Europe to examine her fraternal treatment of the Jews. The love of the French Jews for their country has, on the other hand, well kept pace with this love of their country for them. Nay, at the present juncture the French Jews have

designedly refrained from public and combined denunciation of the Russian policy towards the Jews solely out of patriotic regard for the exigencies of the foreign situation. Even the French Catholics do not find much to admire in the Orthodox Russian Church. The persecution of the Catholics of Poland by successive Russian emperors must ever remain an indelible grievance, deeply graven on the memory of Catholic France.

When France once more gives free rein to her generous enthusiasm for humanity, the Jewish question will not be long in finding its solution. This much is certain—that no alliance can last that rests solely on common enmity, and that no freedom-loving people can long subject itself to a political policy that involves a sacrifice of its conscience and all its innermost convictions. No diplomatic considerations were able to restrain the outspoken condemnation of Russia passed by American public opinion and by the President of the United States. No such considerations prevented the House of Representatives from postponing *sine die* the question of offering assistance to Russia in her present distress. And certain it is that no such considerations will defer the awakening of France to a sense of what she owes to her past, and of what Europe expects of her at this crisis in the history of a great struggle between religious persecution and religious freedom.

It will be obvious to those who appreciate the partnership in anti-Semitism involved by the Franco-Russian alliance that French persecution and the apprehension of a Jewish exodus from France necessarily throws Jewish influence, interests, and sympathy, so far as they exist, on the side of England and the United States; and while, therefore, increasing the value of British protection to the persecuted Hebrew, imposes on the race of Israel the gravest obligations not to injure the hand stretched out to help them in their hour of need.

# VI

# THE JEW IN ENGLAND

# THE JEW IN ENGLAND

## I

It is difficult to ascertain the exact period of the arrival of the Jews in England. William the Conqueror found them settled in large numbers. His son Rufus showed himself favourable to them, encouraging them to dispute with the clergy, whom he hated, and raising them to a powerful position in society, so much so that the reign of Rufus may be regarded as the golden age of Hebrew prosperity in this country. Some idea of Jewish wealth may be gained from the fact that in the year 1188 they contributed £60,000 towards the French war, as against £70,000, the total share borne by the Christian community. Such a contribution, however, may indicate rather exactions by the Government than patriotism or wealth on the part of the Jews.

The persecutions undergone by the Hebrew race in this country are due to the same causes as have affected it elsewhere. First among them is the fact that Jewish wealth excited the covetousness of a rude and warlike people, not overburdened themselves either with sensitive scrupulousness or with worldly

riches. Six centuries back Jews were, as now, the backbone of the trade in money. Financial operations were entirely in their hands, and so completely had they monopolised the manufactures, that the sacred vessels used in the service of the church were supplied by Jewish goldsmiths. The English armies in Normandy and Gascony contained no Jewish archers or javelin men; no Jew was found in the train of knight or baron; they grew rich and prospered at home while the blood of Norman nobles and English men-at-arms was fertilising the plains of France. Such being the case, their unpopularity among men of action is not surprising. They were tolerated simply as the mechanical sources of money. Nor was the fault of this state of things simply on the side of the English. The Jew, in his capacity of money-lender, cannot reasonably have been expected to forego his pound of flesh with unvarying persistency. Money-lenders are always few and debtors invariably in the majority. Lenders, as a class, have never succeeded in acquiring popularity among borrowers. Lord James of Hereford's Bill against money-lenders enshrines a view of the favourite trade of the Hebrew race which has prevailed in England since Jews settled here. When they are of different religion and race, creditors are still further separated from their debtors. A memorable example of this hatred and desire for the plunder of opulent Hebrews is found at the coronation of Richard Cœur de Lion. Jews were excluded from this pageant at Westminster Abbey. Some few of them, impelled by Oriental curiosity, still characteristic of their race, slipped in with the crowd. They were discovered. A

hue and cry was raised and the Jews were chased out of the Abbey by the followers of Jesus of Nazareth. Not content with mere expulsion, religious fervour was quickly reinforced by a desire for loot. The London citizens hunted their prey into the Jewry and revelled in the sack of Hebrew merchandise precisely as the Russian or Galician populace hunts and robs them to-day. Frightful atrocities were committed on the inmates of Jewry. The roar of flames mingled with the screams of tortured Israelites until the murderers drew off, sated with blood and plunder. This is but a single instance of the Jewish massacres which occurred periodically throughout England, and exemplifies the pushful inquisitiveness of a race which to this day is, for the most part, honestly oblivious to the chief causes of its unpopularity.

Another cause of the dislike they early inspired among our ancestors was the practice of a different religion from their Christian brethren. Religious fanaticism was never so strong as at the beginning of the first Crusade, when the burning words of Peter the Hermit induced Godfrey de Bouillon and his fellow Crusaders to plan the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. A wave of religious emotion swept from Lisbon to Vienna and from Newcastle to Syracuse. Abortive but spontaneous movements for the invasion of Palestine arose among the peasantry of Europe. Without leaders, without money or equipments, these movements were doomed to failure. The death or ruin of those who took part in them was inevitable. The crusade of Walter the Penniless is an example of this miscalculated religious fanaticism which overtook the lower orders of

France and the Empire at this time. Too often, in their hatred of the infidel, that is of him who is unfaithful to the religion of Jesus Christ, the peasant armies fell on the Jews for the love of Him whose first lesson was to teach them to love their enemies. In default of Saracen or Turk the hated Jew fell a victim to the billhooks of the crusading peasantry. These tragedies abroad found an echo in England, thus showing the essential solidarity of the Jewish Question in those days. Massacres of Jews took place on the ground that one of the hated race had insulted the Host as it passed down the street to the bedside of the dying. This charge, it may be observed, was not always devoid of foundation. An instance of religious fanaticism mingled with desire for plunder is found at the massacre of the Jews at York. An anti-Semitic riot had arisen. The Jewish community were closely besieged in the castle, where they had taken refuge. As the assault progressed a canon of York cathedral, dressed in full canonicals, was seen to put himself at the head of the stormers and to incite the besiegers to the massacre of "the enemies of Jesus Christ." "Enemy of God," "murderer of our Lord," were favourite cries in London and the other towns of England throughout the Middle Ages. The practice of the Christian faith had not then reached its full development.

It must be remembered that a mediæval butchery of the Jews is rarely to be attributed to a single cause. A trivial incident may have given rise to it, such as the insulting behaviour of a Jewish child to a Christian priest, but the motives which actuated the anti-Semite

mob of the Middle Ages were a mixture of blind unspiritual fanaticism, boorish ignorance, childish suspicion, and a perennial appetite for loot, precisely as the Russian mob and soldiery attack them for the same reasons in the present day.

A third cause of Jewish unpopularity was brutal ignorance and almost insane fancies on the part of the lower orders. At a time when learning was confined to the monastery and the bishop's palace, the common people being steeped in ignorance as profound as that of the Russian peasantry of to-day, it is not surprising that the wildest stories against the Hebrew race found implicit credence among them. Accusations against Jews for poisoning wells, crucifying Christian children, and other charges of nameless horror were constantly levelled at their heads. Tovey, in his "Anglia Judaica," has given the several instances which are upon record of these charges against the Jews, which, he observes, they were never accused of, "but at such times as the king was manifestly in great want of money." The repetition of a wild rumour such as one of the above led to a Jew hunt in the streets of Lincoln. In no case does history record the substantiation of these charges against the Jews of England in the Middle Ages.

Although persecution was general throughout mediæval England, more hospitality was then accorded to the Jewish race in this country than was the case of France or in Spain. With all the crimes of our ancestors, they never produced an Anglican equivalent to Torquemada, nor an institution such as the Holy Inquisition.

Two further causes of English aversion to Jews in Plantagenet times may here be mentioned. One is the fact that Jews formed a community apart from the rest of the population, and held themselves resolutely aloof from the common life of the English. There was little, if any, inter-marriage. Englishman and Jew then lived separate lives. Between the Oriental Dives and the Anglo-Saxon Lazarus there was a great gulf fixed. The second cause is the antipathy too often felt by white men for Asiatics. The Jews are Asiatics, and Englishmen did not then regard alien immigrants from the hinterland of an obscure country on the seaboard of the Eastern Mediterranean with fraternal affection.

Ultimately the cumulative effects of Jewish power, riches, and unpopularity culminated in the issue by Edward I. of an edict in 1290 commanding the Jews to leave the shores of England—16,511 persons crossed the Channel. Persecution attended them even in their exodus. They were deprived of all they possessed, even the pitiful sum retained by them for the expenses of the journey, being in many cases robbed by the chivalrous sailors of the Cinque Ports. There are many instances of the drollery of Jew-drowning in the annals of monkish historians. A captain of the Cinque Ports, says Walter de Hemingford, persuaded a company of Jews whom he had on his ship to walk on the sands at low tide. He left them there until the tide rose and, notwithstanding their prayers, declined to help them, and watched them drown. This took place before the exodus of 1290. But the story shows how Jews were regarded hardly as human beings, the drowning of a batch of them being matter for hilarious laughter.

## II

## THE JEW IN THE ELIZABETHAN ERA

HISTORIANS of the Elizabethan era, great and small, seem to have neglected all consideration of the effect which the Jewish exodus from Britain of 1292 had upon the golden period of English arms, explorations, and letters. Elizabethan glory was attained in the absence of the Chosen People. Unselfish ideas animated Englishmen of varying characters, dissimilar aims, and widely different careers. Perhaps the distinctive note of the Elizabethan era, amid much that was brutal and even sordid, was the unselfish courage and imagination thrown by all sorts and conditions of men into undertakings never dreamed of by previous generations. It is true that the motives of Elizabeth herself, no less than those of Drake, Raleigh, Frobisher, and Hawkins, and lesser men, were disfigured by covetousness; still their greed was that of the gambler playing for high stakes at great personal risk, not the middleman's grasp of profits won by skill and intrepidity not his own. In Drake's theft of the church plate from the cathedral of Lima—one of the worst bits of English filibustering on record—however blameworthy, the risks were enormous, and neither

Drake nor his syndicate of dare-devils even considered the personal danger to which they were exposed. Rash exploits and occasionally great losses, but more often triumphant successes, wrought in a large and generous spirit, distinguished the Elizabethan era. Syndicates existed in the days of the Virgin Queen no less than in those of Victoria, and the syndicates formed in those days for the realisation of colonial aspirations were manifestly animated by something deeper than a love of gain. Chartered companies received the sanction of the Crown. In some of them Elizabeth herself was a shareholder. They were purely English; no Jew is known to have taken part in these enterprises, and the essential difference between the colonial ventures organised in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and those with which we of this epoch are familiar, is marked by features too significant to ignore. Three hundred years ago the capital embarked in a foreign venture was what it was represented to be. The watering of shares was a foreign process yet to be imported. It is an exotic which has been brought by immigrants to our country.

The other point in Elizabethan enterprises which may be noted with interest is that the various enterprises promoted by the great explorers and statesmen of the Tudor Queen were really what they represented themselves to be; they were undertaken in the interests of the English people. Against the Spaniard, robbery, ruin, even torture was inflicted; public morality was at too low an ebb to exact a high standard of altruism in dealing with the foreigner; but it can never be said

that the British public of that day was stripped or despoiled as cosmopolitan financiers bleed, gull, and rob the investing public of to-day.

It is interesting further to note that although one of the most celebrated Shakesperian dramas has a Jew for its central figure, Shakespeare resorted to a foreign country for his type. It is scarcely possible that Doctor Roderigo Lopez, the Jewish physician to Queen Elizabeth, was the original of Shylock. Mr. Sidney Lee, I am aware, holds a contrary view, and Mr. Frederick Hawkins has declared that Shakespeare was induced to write the play with special reference to an outbreak of intolerance caused by the fear of an eruption of Israelites into London about the year 1594. It is not known that Shakespeare ever visited Venice. The play was first produced in 1598, and it is possible that the large tolerance of Shakespeare's genius desired to divert public attention from the revolting character of Barabbas, the Jew of Malta, portrayed by the frankly anti-Semitic Marlowe.

The genius of Shakespeare is rarely displayed in so triumphant a form as in his portraiture of Shylock. The dignity, the pathos, the domestic affections of the old moneylender personify the Jewish character more accurately than the travesty which has been presented by the writer of the Venesyon Comedy or by Kit Marlowe. Shakespeare could scarcely have known in person sufficient Jews to enable him to form a type of the Jew, not only in his own era, but for all time. That he did it is due, not only to his genius, but to the fact that he had recourse to the type which existed on the Continent, though scarcely in England herself.

Although it might be unjust to attribute everything, some contributory element, at all events, of Elizabethan vigour, imperialism, and ideals is due to the absence of the Jewish money-lending element from the shores of England, and it must not be forgotten that although many nations during a portion of their history have been able to contrast their progress and development in the absence of the Jews, with periods when the Hebrew element was allowed free play, no nation has yet witnessed the final result of unchecked Jewish energy after full freedom has been accorded for three generations to their abilities, acquisitiveness, aloofness, and ambition.

Of all countries in the world, England is the one to which the Jews owe an idelible debt of gratitude. As has often happened in our history, England was tardy in accepting the principles of freedom which now form the commonplace of all political parties. England was the first, it is true, in 1293, to eject the Jew from her shores. Her example was copied by her neighbours with equal savagery, though perhaps with no greater vigour. When a softer era dawned, England was not the first to receive the Jew on terms of equality. France, as the acknowledged leader of ideas in Europe, was beforehand with the phlegmatic justice of the English race. Not until later was Jewish emancipation finally accomplished. It is too soon to speak of its result. Agricultural decay, imported food, industrial inflation, a democracy impotent to provide its own means of subsistence, form a soil upon which the Jews have flourished. If the natural increase of British Israelites had been the only factor in the problem,

there is no reason to doubt that, sooner or later, the Anglicisation of the Jewish community would have been accomplished perhaps by this time as effectively as that of the Huguenots who fled here in thousands after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The French immigrants of 1685 are now completely absorbed in the population; as much cannot be said of the bulk of the English Jews. A few families remarkable for their public spirit, refinement, dignity, patriotism, and wealth have given to Englishmen some idea of what the Jew may become when rooted in this country by interests, affections, and patriotism. It had been well both for England and the Jews if the right of ingress had done no more than keep pace with the capacity of the country to absorb them. Unfortunately this has not been the case.

# VII

# THE JEW IN THE ARGENTINE COLONIES

# THE JEW IN THE ARGENTINE COLONIES

THE project of diminishing the Jewish population of Russia by transportation across the shoulder of the world to South America was one that excited enthusiasm among every one ignorant of the conditions under which the transference of a community from one part of the world to the other can be successfully conducted. Apparently nothing was wanted that could make the scheme a success, except the things that were essential. Money was provided in profusion; engineering and military skill were not wanting. Agricultural experts prepared voluminous reports on all the conditions affecting the climate of Argentina. The soil was analysed, machinery was shipped, laws and bye-laws were drawn up.

The population for various colonies was of various kinds. Some of them were carefully selected from the Jewish agricultural population of the Kherson colonies and others, but a larger proportion were refugees from the illiberal and stringent government of the Russian Pale. Two things were wanting. Firstly, the capacity for physical toil involved in the successful cultivation of wheat at the prices which have ruled during the

present decade; and secondly, the willingness of the population thus transshipped to endure the change of life, and to suffer under new heavens and on a new earth an existence for which they had been unfitted by nearly two thousand years of life in the poorer quarters of great European cities.

Baron de Hirsch was more than liberal in his preparations. Nothing was stinted. On his death he confided the care of the Argentine emigrants to the directors of the Jewish Colonisation Association. The labours of these gentlemen are of an international character, but neither their methods nor their management can be criticised, as they do not permit the presence of the independent press at their annual meeting; while their annual report gives no record of the cost incurred in the administration of the project entrusted to them. Generalities instead of details are published. It is known, however, that they sent a Commission to Russia with the object of asking the Chief of the Holy Synod to sanction what he had already refused—viz., liberty to conduct and to colonise within the limits of Holy Russia itself.

It is not too much to say that the colonisation experiments hitherto made on behalf of the Jews are practically failures. The feeling of perseverance is lacking among the colonists. A considerable number drift back to Russia and prefer the evils which they know to prospective advantages which, under the best colonising system in the world, can only accrue to their children, and then only if they alter their trading instincts and intuitive taste for middlemanship into manly resolve to face the severe trials and gambling

uncertainties of agricultural life. To make a true peasant, generations are needed. The fact that Jewish townsmen can in time be converted into a contented and moderately successful peasantry is proved by the results after the third generation of the Nicholas colonies at Kherson. On July 15, 1898, the total number of Jewish colonists in the Argentine Republic was said to be only 6904, or 200 less than in the previous year. Colonisation under the most favourable conditions is one of the most difficult things in the world. The average colonist who is sent out at the charge of philanthropy is necessarily indifferent to his unseen and unknown benefactor; separated from him by space and by mental unconsciousness, the immigrant is, however, keenly sensible of his rights, and not over sensitive as to his duties. Since every Jew colonist is commercially minded by training and instinct, the administration of a Jewish colony is a more difficult undertaking even than that of a robust Anglo-Saxon community. In the case of the Argentine colonies founded by Baron de Hirsch the power of the press was freely availed of by the colonists for the purpose of extorting from the administrators greater liberality and better terms than would have been given under the conditions of the contract. One letter, which is dated Moisesville, June 15, 1898, published in the *Courier de la Plata*, informs the party to whom it is addressed that nothing in the world can be worse than the situation in the colonies. The writer observes that in the wilds of Africa and in the days of the Inquisition matters could not be worse, and that the colonists are broken in spirit and heart by their treatment. This

spirit of discontent is familiar to every one who has had anything to do with colonisation, but hundreds of similar letters might be cited to show, not the incompetence of the administration but the discontent of the Jewish colonists with their lot. A few, of course, have succeeded, but the idea that colonisation in the Argentine is a solution of the Jewish population question in Central Europe is the visionary desire of generous and imaginative but unpractical minds. I have had myself too much experience of practical colonisation to attach the least importance to the incessant complaints of the Jewish emigrants. I have known a Christian colonist, an Englishman, and a communicant of the Church of England, who afterwards succeeded in life, write home to his friends with the statement: "I have not had fresh butter for a fortnight and the thought of it almost breaks me down." Mere discontent is no criterion of the impracticability of a colonising scheme; but there are two conditions which are absolutely essential for success—one is, that the colonist must be by training and heredity able and willing to work hard; and the other is, that the colonist must enter upon his new life with the determination to be absorbed by and become part of the community which he joins. Neither of these conditions is complied with by the Jews. Until they are, no Jewish colonisation to distant lands will do much to solve the Jewish problem.

Another element of feebleness in Jewish Argentine colonies—a difficulty that enters into every colonising experiment, without one exception, that is known to me—is the inability to enforce the payment of debt.

According to the *Jewish Chronicle* (July 15, 1898) not a single instalment has been paid during the seven years of the existence of the colonies, although there have been some good years which made some attempt at payment perfectly feasible. The expenditure of two millions of money, or the interest of it, the manufacture of inefficient paupers and a multiplication of dishonest colonists at great cost form a questionable contribution to the solution of the difficulty. It is probable that the future history of the Argentine colonies will follow closely that of their predecessors in the Kherson provinces. For the first twenty years of that experiment miserable failure was the only result. Bacon has wisely said in his "Essay on Plantations" that twenty years must pass before we can look for a profit. Although some future success may reasonably be looked for from the second and third generations of the Jewish colonists in Argentina, the immediate outlook is not a hopeful one, but under the best possible conditions reasonably to be expected, it is impossible to regard colonisation in South America as affording any greater solution of the Jewish question than the colonisation of Palestine or Zionism itself.

# VIII

# THE ALOOFNESS OF ISRAEL

# THE ALOOFNESS OF ISRAEL

CHAMPIONS of the Chosen People, when joining issue with critics who charge them with the habits of isolation commonly imputed to the working-class Jews of all nations, usually rejoin that the alien character of their co-religionists does not really exist, and that the charge is a figment of anti-Semitic imagination. Jewish champions in this country are wont to compare themselves and their co-religionists with the descendants of French Huguenots who emigrated to England more than two centuries ago. No Englishman of to-day would dream of imputing alienage to the posterity of the refugees who settled in England after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Englishmen who trace their descent back to Norman, Saxon, French, Dutch, or even Russian origin are English in every sense of the word, because the marriages of their ancestors, and the general adoption of English food, language, habits, and conditions of life, quickly obliterated the distinctive and alien type originally introduced by the first French Protestants who settled in this country. The English race, to use a homely simile, is not unlike a tureen of soup comprising various materials, such as meat with its bone and gristle, herbs, wine, spices, flour, fish,

sauces, and other ingredients simmering under such conditions of heat and time as are required to produce a homogeneous and appetising whole. No matter what may be the original stuff of the various materials employed in making the soup, the result is pottage with a definite entity marked by certain known and recognisable qualities. The difference between the Jewish element in the soup of our national life and every other constituent nationality consists in the fact that whereas all the others freely intermarry, talk, worship, eat with us, and fight for us, the stricter Jews (that is the bulk of them) will do none of these things; they remain aloof; they preserve their tribal customs; they are too proud of their origin and their destiny not to feel contemptuously towards the people by whom they are sheltered and on whom they exist.

In an article in the *Contemporary Review*, dated January 1898, alleged to be by Mr. J. Dyche, a Jewish alien workman, are the following words:

> Any one who is even a little acquainted with the life of the foreign Jews in this country will often hear them say that the "yokel" (the name by which the Englishman is known amongst them) can live on much less than they do. A close acquaintance with their lives confirms this. In a Jewish family the husband is the sole bread-winner. . . .
>
> Contrast this with the action of the British workman, who exploits the labour of his wife and children, and who began to exploit the labour of the latter at the age of six when he was allowed to do so.
>
> The Jewish workman possesses the quality of his race—he is an artist, and if his work sometimes lacks strength and durability, it is never wanting in taste or finish. The English

workman is in this respect a mere labourer. His work is like his temperament, drink, and diet—strong, solid, and durable, but at the same time rough, coarse, and tasteless. In matters of style and taste the English workman can only follow the foreigner.

There is no need of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children so far as the Jews are concerned. The Jewish workman, at the worst, cares for his family only, which absorbs all his cares and attention; but very often he lives for his relatives, religion, or race. The heart of the average British workman never throbs with any such sentiments; I doubt whether it beats at all, except, perhaps, when he is engaged in rabbit-coursing, dog-fighting, or other such noble and instructive amusements. Poor innocent creature! Imagine him being demoralised by a drunken Jew or a loose Jewish woman! Is not every one aware that the Jews are a sober people, and have, therefore, no teetotalers—the greatest evil drink has produced—amongst them, and that their women are proverbial for their chastity, except, perhaps, in cases where they become thoroughly Anglicised? I came across a Jewish woman who drank and had acquired a large and varied stock of English expletives. This remarkable phenomenon was explained to me by her neighbours as due to the fact that she had been brought up among "yokels," and was married to a pure-blooded Briton. And yet people complain that we do not become Anglicised! Who ever heard among foreign Jews of those brutal fights, vicious language, and disgraceful scenes with which the British workman enlivens the monotony of his Sabbath? Why, some of what were the most dangerous places in the East of London, such as Flower and Dean Street, Brady Street, and others, have become, since the foreign Jews settled there, the quietest, peacefullest places in London, where one can go to bed at any time and not be kept awake all night by the drunken orgies of English men and women.

I am speaking now of my experience when I lived in Spitalfields a few years ago, in a street inhabited mostly by true-born Britons. In Whitechapel the contrast between the native and foreign population is most striking. On one hand you find people who are at as low a grade of drunkenness and vice as it is possible for human beings to come to. On the other, sober, peaceful, and industrious people, from whose lips will never fall an expression that can offend the most sensitive lady, but who are poor—an unpardonable offence in England, especially for a foreigner.

Are we a "dead-weight on progress"? On whose progress are we a dead-weight? Certainly not the British workman's, for I do not think there could be a greater dead-weight on progress than the British working man himself.

The Chief Rabbi, Dr. Herman Adler, wrote as follows on March 10, 1887:

It is an admitted fact that in former years one rarely, if ever, heard of an unchaste Hebrew maiden in this country. I grieve to be obliged to say that this happy state of things no longer exists. The extension of the social evil to my community may be directly traced to the overstocked labour market, and to the Russian persecutions, continuing to this day, which cause thousands of Jewish girls to arrive at these shores without any means of subsistence.

Dr. Adler afterwards withdrew this statement, but it is difficult to understand that it could have been made without a strong foundation of fact, at least as regards the destitution of immigrants, many of whom were employed in the clothing trade. Mr. Dyche himself declares "the Jewish woman" to be "idle, wasteful, and extravagant"—an element that impartial persons

may regard as an addition of questionable value to our thriftless population.

When it is asserted that the standard of comfort in "the life of the foreign Jews of this country" is higher than that of Englishmen, the weight of evidence does not sustain the assertion. Comparison between dissolute, ignorant, and improvident British labourers and thrifty, well-paid foreign Jewish artisans of the higher class would no doubt confirm the contention. For more than controversial purposes, however, such comparison would be useless. The only proper comparison is to be made between people of the same class. Nobody denies that some British workmen drink, and that the homes of drunkards are debased. The average Jewish "greener" is not a highly paid artisan.

An accurate description of the mode in which these miserable folk live in London was given by Mr. Lakeman, one of our factory inspectors, in his evidence before the Sweating Commission, and affords an instance of aloofness undesirable from every point of view:

> The habits of these people are very, very dirty; they seem almost to revel in dirt rather than in cleanliness. Going into some workshops, you find a filthy bed, on which garments which are made are laid; children perfectly naked lying about the floor and on the beds; frying pans and all sorts of dirty utensils, with food of various descriptions, on the bed, under the bed, over the bed—everywhere; clothes hanging on a line, with a large gas stove to dry them, the ashes all falling about, and the atmosphere so dense that you get ill after a night's work there. The temperature, as tested by me, was found to be 90 degrees.

Besides the social and racial aloofness of the foreign immigrants there is a further element which differentiates the most Anglicised Jew who remains loyal to his faith from all other foreigners. This element in the problem is the fact of his close connection both by blood and religion with a kindred community in every foreign country. This is seen whenever the question of the good or evil conduct of a Jew is discussed in the public press. At the outset of the recent Dreyfus case Jews believed Dreyfus to be innocent for the same reason that the crazy anti-Semites believed him to be guilty, the judgment in both cases being arrived at without one tittle of evidence on either side, although the illegality of the trial was not in question. There is not a synagogue or a Jewish congregation in Poland, Lithuania, or Galicia which does not in case of need justly exercise over humane Jews in Western Christendom a stronger influence than any of the social or religious forces of the country in which they are domiciled. Under the stress of persecution, or even of criticism, the solidarity of the modern Jews is complete, and it is completer between Jews of different nationalities than between the Jewish community of a given country and the native inhabitants when persecution and criticism are absent. Jews quarrel among themselves as ferociously as the most exemplary Christians. Whatever an Englishman may or may not be, it is clear that the members of no race or fragment of a race can be deemed English when their diet is foreign, their origin Oriental, when their ties with alien co-religionists in other lands are closer than with Britons, and when, for successive generations, they have proudly declined to

intermarry with the people of their adopted country. It is no answer to say that some of the richest, the most enlightened and Anglicised of the Jews have married Christians, and will do so again. The fact is indisputable, and is greatly to the advantage both of Christendom and of Jewry. The proportion of mixed marriages, however, between Jews and non-Jews is so small as to constitute an immaterial factor in the problem, while Jewesses who marry Christians are looked on by the bulk of their own people, even in the middle classes, as the victims of *mésalliance*.

A brilliant but sinister novel, "Dr. Phillips,"* written by a Jewess, throws light on this point. A number of Jewish middle class matrons are discussing the prospect of a daughter of one of them marrying a Christian :

> Mrs. Collings said she would rather see one of her children dead than married to a Christian. Mrs. Detmar would not go quite as far as that; only she would, certainly, rather see hers married to the poorest Jew that ever walked, even to an absolute pauper. Mrs. Jeddington said she did not think things were as bad as that; she would rather see Soph married to "one of their own people," of course, but she did not think her father would mind either way.
>
> Mrs. Montague Levy said: "Mixed marriages never came to any good," and instances were cited (p. 165).

Speaking of the quality of aloofness in the middle class Jews, the talented authoress of "Dr. Phillips" continues :

> Theirs is a society worth describing before, as must be in

* Vizetelly & Co.

the natural order of things, it decays or amalgamates. It is a fact little understood that here, in the heart of a great and cosmopolitan city, sharing in, and appropriating its riches, there is a whole nation dwelling apart in an inviolable seclusion, which they at once cultivate, boast of, and are ashamed at. There are houses upon houses in the West Central districts, in Maida Vale, in the City, which are barred to Christians, to which the very name of Jew is an open sesame.

All the burning questions of the hour are to them a dead letter; art, literature, and politics exist not for them. They have but one aim, the acquisition of wealth. Playing cards at each other's houses is their sole experience of the charms of social intercourse; their interests are bounded by their homes and those of their neighbouring brethren (p. 168).

In a sort of jealous exclusiveness these Jews lived by and among themselves. They fancied they did so from choice. It was not so; it was a remnant of the time when the yellow cap and curiously shaped gaberdine marked them out as lepers in the crowd. The garb had been discarded, but the shrinking feeling of generations was still lingering. There is a certain pride in these people; they are at once the creatures and the outcasts of civilisation. The difference between Jew and Gentile was once one of religion. Now it is a difference that it will take as many centuries of intermarriage to bring about. The Jews feel this acutely. They remember the leper mark that has been taken from them, and they shrink from accentuating the remembrance by association with the people whose ancestors affixed it

Put two strange Jews, one from London and one from the Antipodes, amid a hundred people of other nationalities, and in a quarter of an hour they will have recognised their kinship, and have gravitated towards each other in unconscious Ishmaelitism against the rest of the company.

Sections of them are trying very hard to struggle against

this race barrier, and with a modicum of success. But they have much to contend against (p. 60).

It is unnecessary, however, to have recourse to the pages of a novel to probe the inner mind of a modern Jew on the subject of mixed marriages. Occasionally the London magistrates are invited to adjudicate on cases which illustrate the objection referred to.

The following is an instance of a Jewish objection to a Christian wife and appeared in the London papers of August 18, 1898:

At the Thames Police-court, yesterday, a foreign Jew applied to Mr. Mead for advice about his wife. She had married him under false pretences.

Mr. Mead: How is that?

Applicant: She has fooled me.

Mr. Mead: How has she fooled you?

Applicant: I married her thinking she was a Jewish woman. She said she was, and now I find out she is a Christian.

Mr. Mead: Do you mean Christian by descent or of the Christian religion?

Applicant: I find it out, and I cannot live with a Christian woman.

Mr. Mead: Why not?

Applicant: I am a Jew.

Mr. Mead: She may be of Jewish descent.

Applicant: No. I can tell. I spoke to her many times, and find that she is no Jewess. The man who signed her marriage paper as her father is not her father at all.

Mr. Mead advised applicant to go to the Chief Rabbi, who possessed extraordinary powers of divorce. He was not prepared to say whether the marriage was valid or not. If it were not he would have to go to the Divorce Court for a

decree of nullity of marriage. If applicant could prove that the alleged father or the wife had made a false declaration he (Mr. Mead) would grant a summons.

In a remarkable letter from Mr. Alfred G. Henriques (*Jewish Chronicle*, October 14, 1898) is the following passage :

> They [*i.e.*, the Jews] hold the aggressive belief that they are the chosen people of the Most High ; and they also believe in the sinfulness of mixed marriages. I beg a patient consideration of these two points, and I ask—is it possible to arouse resentment among other peoples more thoroughly than by insistence on those two doctrines? The Jews have gone in for separation, their legislation emphasises *difference* as the first object of their peculiar laws. The result could only be as it is. Of course there are other practices, needless to refer to, that further accentuate difference, and complete the separation effectually.

Mr. Henriques concludes by asking his co-religionists to abandon the two doctrines of the Chosen People and the sinfulness of mixed marriages. In doing so he raised a storm which lifted the curtain that usually hides the communal attitude towards Gentiles and their ways. Mr. Henriques is told that he is inviting the abandonment of "the principles of Judaism" ; that he is "suffering from the utter lack of Jewish religious faith," and that he is "outraging the feelings of those not similarly perplexed, but who are enjoying the comfort of sincere belief in the Holy Scriptures" ; and he is invited to cease from "further insults to his fellow Jews by launching his profane anathemas against their cherished religion."

Should we renounce [asks another writer] our glorious heritage as world teachers and witnesses of God's providence for the sake of a paltry unpopularity almost beneath our notice, and that has been caused in Western Europe at least by the faults and failings of apostatised and disloyal Jews themselves?

This most interesting correspondence attracted no attention in the newspapers and current literature of the day. Nevertheless it is worth noting that loyal and observant Jews claim the promises of Isaiah and the injunctions of Ezra on the subjects of separation and intermarriage with aliens to be as valid to-day as at the hour of their utterance. Pious Jews claim to be the Chosen People, and regard intermarriage as sinful. Even those who, like the writer, view with foreboding the future effect of these doctrines on the Jewish community and English democracy alike, cannot fail to recognise the steadfast faith and spiritual elevation of those Jews who cling to the ancient ways for conscience' sake.

Another matter that leads to the aloofness of Israel is the fondness of poor Jewish parents for the Chedorim, or elementary school, in which children are taught the elements of Hebrew and religion. The pedagogic principles employed are very primitive, instruction being merely an exercise in memory. The sanitary conditions also often leave much to be desired. In civilised communities, the tendency has been to replace these Chedorim by schools on more modern principles, which include secular subjects in their curriculum. ("Jewish Year Book." 1898–1899.)

Lord Rothschild has sent the following circular letter (in English and Yiddish) to the parents of every male pupil in the Jews' Free School:

JEWS' FREE SCHOOL,
BELL LANE, SPITALFIELDS, E.

*December* 1898.

DEAR FRIEND,—I desire to address you on a subject of very great importance concerning the health and well-being of your sons, and affecting their future development, physical and intellectual.

I know what love and devotion Jewish parents feel for their children, how hard they work for them and what sacrifices they submit to in order to promote their welfare. I know also how ardently they desire to see their children brought up in the doctrines of our holy religion, and that they should be properly instructed in Hebrew and in the tenets of our sacred faith.

But it has long seemed to me that you may be doing your children harm by the over-zeal which prompts you to send them to the Chedorim for so many hours a day. Visitors have noticed how pale and tired the boys attending the free school look, and how their weariness increases with each hour of the day. This was particularly noticed by H.M. Inspector during a recent visit. He was impressed by the appearance of fatigue so noticeable among the boys. At first he thought they might be underfed, or that they suffered from some form of home neglect. But being assured that the children were well looked after by their parents, he questioned them and then discovered the true cause of their tired looks. He found that many boys attend the Chedorim as early as 7 o'clock in the morning and remain there till it is time to go to school. Immediately school is over, they return to the Chedorim and stay there till 8 or 9 o'clock at night. They thus spend twelve or thirteen hours a day in their studies, a large proportion of this time being passed among insanitary surroundings.

In consequence of this over-pressure, H.M. Inspector has strongly urged the committee of the free school to shorten the school hours. The committee have this matter now under their serious consideration. There is little doubt they will carry out the suggestion of H.M. Inspector. The inevitable result of such a change will be that you will have to keep your children longer at school than you do at present, and you will thus be deprived of their services at a time when you can ill afford to spare them.

I ask you, are you not expecting too much of children of tender age? Do not these long hours seriously injure their health? Some time ago, Dr. Schorstein stated publicly that his experience at the London Hospital showed him that the Chedorim were ruining the health of the children attending them, that the bodies and minds of your little ones became enfeebled, and that in consequence they were less able to withstand the various illnesses to which children are subject.

While appreciating your motives, I would beg to point out to you how unwise is your action. Far be it from me to under-value the religious instruction your children should receive, but I venture to think, that sufficient teaching in this most important subject is given at the free school, where the Hebrew and religious syllabus, issued and sanctioned by the Chief Rabbi, is thoroughly well taught. A great many hours a week are given to Hebrew reading, translation, Bible history, Hebrew grammar, the observances of the Calendar, and last but not least, to Ethics and the Moral Law. Surely, this instruction should prove sufficient.

By the course you are pursuing you are positively injuring the future prospects of your children, for, if they come to school tired and unrefreshed, how can they do themselves justice in their secular studies? Their progress is hindered, and either you must keep them at school more years than

would otherwise be necessary, or, if you take them away at the legal age, they are not sufficiently educated to acquit themselves well in the battle of life. Instead of rising in the industrial world, they sink into the ruck of ill-paid and over-crowded occupations and remain the mere drudges of society.

I earnestly beg of you, therefore, to take my words to heart and withdraw your children from the Chedorim altogether, or at least reduce the hours during which they attend. They will then grow up healthy and strong, fitted in every way to pursue an honourable career, and with a reasonable prospect of becoming good and worthy English citizens.

I am,

Very truly yours,

ROTHSCHILD.

Another instance of the separation of the Jews from their Gentile fellow subjects is to be discovered in the recent claims of the Cohanim, or priestly class, for exemption from service at inquests. In consequence of their priestly descent the Cohens claim certain privileges, and among others, under the command of Leviticus xxi. 1, 3, refuse to contaminate themselves by being in the same place as the dead.*

* Lev. xxi. 1, 3: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people: And for his sister a virgin, that is nigh unto him, which hath had no husband, for her he may be defiled."

Cohenism at Inquests.—*Jewish Chronicle*, November 11, 1898.—Mr. Frederick Shiers, of Halliwell Lane, Cheetham, who was summoned to serve upon a jury at the Manchester City Coroner's Court on Friday last, asked to be relieved of the duty on Scriptural grounds. The Bible, he said, told him that he was not to be in the same apartment as a dead person. He handed to the Coroner (Mr. Sidney Smelt)

A further symptom of the gradual growth of Jewish power in England, and the success with which privileges denied to other races and to every other form of

a letter from the Rev. Dr. Salomon, Minister of the Manchester Great Synagogue.

The Coroner: It is a mistaken idea altogether. I have read the Bible very carefully, and commentaries also, with a view to discovering whether there is any authority for such an objection as yours, but I fail to find it. The Bible says that anybody who touches a dead body is unclean, but it says nothing against anybody looking at a body. If I touch such a body I am unclean, and so is anybody else, whether a son of Aaron or not, until he washes himself. We do not want you to touch a body. I shall respect any reasonable interpretation of the Bible. Assuming that you are a son of Aaron—and it will require a rather long pedigree to prove that—I shall not accept a strained interpretation of the text with the object of your avoiding a service which other gentlemen living in this country and governed by our laws have to fulfil.

Shiers persisted that his religious convictions precluded him from such a service. He had never been in a house where there was a dead person, and he did not intend to go into one. The letter from Dr. Salomon contained proof that he was a son of Aaron.

The Coroner, who did not peruse the letter, said he could not accept that as evidence. He wanted to know how Shiers claimed to be a descendant of Aaron.

Shiers: My father taught me so, and I am carrying out his wishes. I'm sorry I cannot view the body.

The Coroner: You must sit down. You will have to take your turn with the rest. That is my determination.

Shiers: I am sorry to object, but I cannot do it, dare not do it, and shall not do it.

The Coroner: You will have to do it.

Shiers repeated that he would not view any bodies; he would not even see the bodies of relatives, and he dared not go into a burial ground. He thought it very wrong of the Coroner to persist in his going to see a body when he objected.

The Coroner again pointed out that he did not know of any text in the Bible in support of Shiers' argument.

Shiers: Perhaps you are not so well acquainted with the Bible as our Rabbi.

The Coroner: I have discussed the matter with Dr. Salomon, and

religion except the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, and Wesleyan bodies, which number millions, not thousands, among their followers, are granted to the Jews, is the expenditure of State funds in the

he has not thrown any new light upon it. When you live in England you must be prepared to obey the English laws.

Shiers: I do as far as I am allowed to do.

The Coroner (handing a Bible to Shiers): Take that into a corner of the Court and find the place where it says that a descendant of Aaron must not view the body of a dead person. If you find it you can go, but you don't leave this room without permission.

Shiers took the Bible, but again said he would not see the bodies. He would sit in the Court the whole day if the Coroner wished it.

The Coroner: I say without fear of contradiction that the interpretation you are putting on the Bible is a strained one.

When the business of the Court, which consisted of several inquests, had been concluded the Coroner asked Shiers if he had found any Scriptural justification for his refusal to view a body, and the juryman thereupon pointed to the first verse of the twenty-first chapter of the Book of Leviticus, which reads: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people."

The Coroner said this could scarcely be held to apply as Shiers was not a high priest. Then, as to another quotation which Shiers made, to the effect that a man was unclean if he touched anything dead, the Coroner pointed out that to it was added, "unless he wash his flesh with water." That was only a practical truth. If a man was clean by washing after he had touched the body, what could be required of him if he merely looked at it? Shiers would have to take his turn in future, and if he did not the consequence would be serious. The custom of viewing bodies was practically a useless one, but it had to be done in the present state of the law.

Shiers, who had not been actually sitting upon the jury, and therefore was not required to view the bodies, was discharged by the Coroner.

The Rev. Dr. Salomon, minister of the Manchester Great Synagogue, and the Rev. I. Simon, minister of the South Manchester Synagogue, wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* to explain the Jewish law and tradition on the subject of Cohanim and defilement by contact with dead bodies.

erection of synagogues at Wormwood Scrubs,* Parkhurst, and Pentonville Prisons. Government have apparently admitted the right of Jewish prisoners to separate worship at the public expense.

The refusal to intermarry, the maintenance of separation as a Chosen People, the different diet, the non-observance of Sunday, the claims of the Cohanim to evade civic duties, the Talmudic education given in the Chedorim or elementary schools, the religious claims of prisoners for synagogues at the public expense, are examples of the separate tendencies of the Jewish people domiciled in England.

* House of Commons.

*Thursday, April 28, 1898.*

JEWS IN WORMWOOD SCRUBS.

Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he was aware that a synagogue was being erected in Wormwood Scrubs Prison; whether the number of Jews in that prison was sufficient to justify this expenditure; and whether the average number of Jews in the prison population had largely increased in recent years.

Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) asked whether it was usual to give public information as to the number of prisoners of any particular denomination in prison.

Sir M. W. Ridley (Lancashire, Blackpool): The answer to the first two paragraphs is in the affirmative. The building is being erected to supply a long-standing need and remedy what has been felt to be a grievance by the Jewish community. I have no definite information on the point raised in the last paragraph, but the number on Monday last was thirty-seven. It is obviously inexpedient to supply information about the decrease or otherwise of any religious persuasion, but for the purpose of the hon. member I think I have given him all the information.

Since the Home Secretary's reply to Mr. Pickersgill the Prison Commissioners inform me (March 18, 1899) that it is the intention to form a synagogue at Pentonville Prison during the next financial year.

What is true of the middle-class Jew in England is even more pronounced in the destitute and recent immigrants from Russia or Poland, who form, with their descendants, the bulk of the Jewish colonists in Great Britain and Ireland. Assiduous, supple, temperate, many of them succeed in shaking off the chains of their poverty. In the second or third generation individuals among their descendants may become successful in letters or in art. But the language employed by the authoress of "Dr. Phillips" is applicable to the poorer classes of the Jews to an even greater extent than to those above them in social rank.

In the words of a German writer (Robert Hessen, *Preussische Jarbucher*, November 1889): "As long as the Jews do not find it to their advantage to become national in their feelings, so long every exhortation and every measure will be in vain."

One of the chief difficulties in the way of nationalising and absorbing the Jewish element is the persistence with which they adhere to the dietary system laid down by Moses. It is true that the conditions that existed in the days of the great Hebrew legislator were totally different from those prevailing to-day. Still, the general immunity of the Jewish race from zymotic disease is probably due, to a large extent, to the purity of the materials composing their repasts, and the special care taken in the examination and preparation of the flesh of animals. Since hygiene has become in all civilised countries the object of a national and municipal care, the necessity for separate diet, demanded and insisted on by the stricter class of Jews—which practically includes the best members of the community—has

completely passed away. There is no religious significance in separate food; its provision is neither a Mosaic nor a Talmudic command, the breach of which constitutes a breach of the law. Still, the aloofness of the Jews is largely due to the unwillingness of the vast majority of them to eat with Christians. In some cases this tendency is carried to an absurd point. One of the most eminent Rabbis in Russia, the late Isaac of Mohilieff, recently visited this country. Looking upon the preparation of food even in the kitchens of his co-religionists as not complying with the canon prevalent among the strict Jews in Russia, he ate and drank nothing during the whole of his sojourn in this country except bread and wine.

A recent instance of Jewish aloofness in the matter of diet is afforded in the applications made to the authorities of one of our public schools to arrange for special cooking for the Jewish boys attending that school. This request was refused, and I understand with the full assent of the more liberal, progressive, and Anglicised members of the community in this country.

Since the Jewish Question is by no means a question merely of race rivalry or of "bread envy," there are no greater enemies of Judaism than the idealists among the Jews themselves, who encourage aloofness and separation in matters of no importance. Prejudice and envy alone could never have produced the anti-Semitic feeling now universal throughout the world. Money is no longer merely earned. It is won as the result of a struggle which stands in closer relation to war itself than to the exchange or sale of commodities. It is no longer necessary that fortunes should be

gained by industry, although it is true that this quality is important. There is another element which seems to be almost universal in the Semitic race—viz., the inborn proclivity to perceive with lightning glance the right moment to "corner" the market. During the present century, therefore, the evolution of a new influence may be detected—that of the self-made millionaire.

Under existing conditions it is impossible that any man, however clever or able, can honestly make a million sterling within the space of a year or two, and if he succeed in doing so, his triumph is attained at the expense of others; not by making two blades of grass grow where one grew before, nor by fulfilling the useful function of intermediary between individuals and communities. As a promoter or as an expert in the flotation of companies, in deluding the public by inflating worthless securities with an artificial and effervescent value, and in the art of hypnotising large communities of shareholders into the belief that something is to be made out of nothing, or that vast risks and the hundred to one chances may be taken with impunity, there is no equal to the Jew. His success is almost imperial, and has introduced, as I have said, a completely new and dangerous element into modern society. The nabobs of the last century were laughed at. They may have raised the wages of the neighbourhood and made themselves remarkable for vulgarity and display, but at no previous period in the history of Europe has the provision of "rigging the markets" assumed its present alarming influence and strength. In London, during the season, the family mansions of

the old nobility, who by reason of the agricultural decay are obliged to let their houses, are not seldom inhabited by persons of this class. Eager competitors in the struggle for financial life, the capacity of Jewish exploiters to set duller brains to work for them, and to beguile the simple of their savings, is almost without a rival. It is, I believe, a fact that in the town of Johannesburg itself among the firms that have acquired vast wealth from the sale of shares in gold mining to the public of Europe, there is but one non-Jewish firm which may be counted among the successful. The whole of the others are Jewish. This is a phenomenon that adds to the aloofness of Israel, and causes masses of the community to regard the whole race with silent aversion.

The self-assurance and patience under blame, criticism, or contumely, or even insult, is of immense assistance to the Jew in his race for wealth, since the art of self-advertisement is unattainable without these qualities. In public life it is more and more the case that men of refinement and cultivation decline to undergo the humiliation entailed upon them by the compulsory self-advertisement that is almost indispensable to success. The non-religious cosmopolitan Jew is an advertiser of the first rank. He perceives with an alertness of apprehension, far in advance of that of the rest of the community, the dormant tendencies of the public mind. With his hand always on the pulse of public opinion, he diagnoses the fever and the unrest afflicting the nation he honours with his presence with clinical success and also with the detachment of mind peculiar to the race. Self-assurance, capacity for self-

advertisement, and the accuracy with which the Jew leads public opinion supply further reasons for the aloofness of the Hebrew race. Notwithstanding the social stigma under which he suffers in continental countries and in the United States, where no Jew is allowed to enter what is technically termed "Society," his appetite for social recognition, for titles, decorations, and honours has been fully illustrated during the last ten years, especially in the annals of French anti-Semitism. A *mot* current in Paris during the Reinach scandal concisely expresses the unpopularity of the rich Hebrews thus afflicted with indifference to honour and hunger for honours: "In former days it was said that they put the thief on the cross; under the Third Republic they placed the cross on the thief."

Consulships, as is well known, are much sought after and largely filled by Jews. The tenure of office, although unpaid or remunerated with a pittance under a Great Power, carries with it a certain amount of social distinction, which is, after money, the one thing most eagerly sought after by many of the children of Israel. Great Britain was recently represented at Frankfort, Vienna, and Berlin by foreign Jews, who were paid wholly inadequate salaries for the duties they had to perform. While on this subject it may be said that little good will be done in the extension of British trade while so many of the Consulates are filled by foreigners. It is tolerably certain that when Parliament accepts this view, and insists on the Consulates being filled by men of British birth, the number of Jews displaced from office will be sufficient to raise the cry that their supersession is the result, not of necessary

trade policy, but of anti-Semitism, a charge that will be wholly without foundation.

But after all that has been said about the causes that separate the Jews from the Gentiles, it is impossible for the impartial student of the position in Europe to-day to resist the conclusion that the wealth and the power of the Jews on the Continent, in England, and in the United States are the result of their exceptional fitness in the face of heavy odds for the battle of life. Having attempted to survey the Jewish Question in all the principal countries of the world, I am unable to avoid the conclusion that where the nations are being destroyed by the Jews they deserve to be destroyed; that weakness, self-indulgence, stupidity, want of proper education and of common foresight, and indifference to the trust that each generation holds for its successor, are the real reasons why the Jews are victorious and the non-Jews are the vanquished. There are some States and races against whom the Jew is powerless to act. On the Yankee of the Eastern States, the Auvergnat, the Scotchman, the Armenian, and on the Greek mercantile community, he makes no impression: he bites a file.

# IX

# MONEY LENDERS

## MONEY LENDERS

THE attraction of Jews to traffic in money has led many people erroneously to suppose that money-lending is not as obnoxious to good Jews as to good Christians. It can scarcely have escaped attention, however, that the evidence on the money-lending system examined by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, which made the most thorough exposure of its ramifications and most completely aroused public opinion, was supplied by Sir George Lewis, himself of Hebrew race. Before speaking, therefore, on the connection between money-lending and Jews, common justice requires me to state that the antipathy which prevails in a certain portion of the Jewish community towards money-lenders and their methods is certainly as strong as that in any other section of the public. There are many Anglicised Jews who nourish unsleeping antipathy towards Jewish money-lenders. If Gentiles were to treat unscrupulous money-lenders as they are treated by some of their fellow Jews much of the evil of which the nation has had so many examples would never have occurred. It is within common knowledge that Englishmen of standing and public reputation now accept money-

lenders' hospitality. At the beginning of the century few English gentlemen would condescend to be the guest of a Jew usurer, however rich or socially ambitious he may have been. Still, with all the righteous indignation of the Jewish community and the Jewish press against the Jewish money-lender, the hard facts of the situation cannot be ignored. Hundreds and even thousands of the Jewish aliens who settle in this country become, or hope to become, traffickers in money. All the avenues leading to the money-lending trade are crowded with Jews.

This tendency in the race is recognised in the rules and regulations laid down for the conduct of the inmates of Jewish charitable institutions. At the Hampstead Convalescent Home for Jews, founded by the Baroness de Hirsch, the patients are expressly enjoined to abstain from traffic, barter, or trade. Jewish lawyers in growing numbers have adopted the legal profession because their fathers or their relatives were money-lenders, and because profitable business can, therefore, be placed in their hands. Sometimes arrangements are made between father and son which are occasionally revealed to the public in open court, and with the father as a money-lender and the son as a solicitor the combination is effective against the thoughtless, pleasure-loving, or hard-driven Anglo-Saxon. The effects of this system on the legal profession and on the nation are conspicuously objectionable.

These evils are so apparent to thoughtful and Anglicised Jews that it has been said by more than one of them that the time is coming in this country when

no self-respecting Jew will allow his son to embark on a financial career, not because such a life is not reputable, but because it is found in practice that such connections lower the reputation of the Jewish race. Every writ against a defaulting debtor brings £2 13s. to the legal mill, and young Jewish lawyers, red-hot from their examinations and hungry for business, are unable to resist the whisperings of cupidity. Fees are wrung from the exhausted debtor, and while the usurer's hands encircle the throat of his victim, the lash of the lawyer's whip falls heavily and mercilessly on the wretched man.

This partnership of Jew lawyer and Jew money-lender is one of the most fruitful fields from which the harvest of legitimate anti-Semitism is gathered and garnered. It is undoubtedly true that the legal jackal to the Jewish money-lender who is willing to sail near the wind, to indulge in questionable practices, and to press on the confines of illegality, is more numerous to-day than he was ten years ago, and is likely to be more numerous still ten years hence.

Sir George Lewis divides usurers into two classes: Londoners, and those who spread a network throughout the country.

Dealing with the latter class first, the legislation he suggested was as follows:

> Whosoever being a professional money-lender, or his manager, clerk, or agent, shall circulate or publish or concur in the circulation or publishing any written statement that he should know to be false, with intent to deceive or injure or

defraud any person who may enter into any contract for a loan of money, shall be guilty of misdemeanour.

It is believed that if a clause of that sort were passed the whole system of issuing false prospectuses and circulars would collapse.

The next proposal is directed against the amount of interest usurers charged for their loans. The usual interest is about 60 per cent. With default interest the evidence showed that it sometimes amounts to 2000 per cent. Sir George Lewis is in favour of giving to her Majesty's judges and registrars of county courts and registrars in bankruptcy the right to fix a fair rate of interest, whatever the contract made with the money-lender. It is an open question, however, whether the advantage to be derived from rescuing foolish or vicious people who have involved themselves with money-lenders is not more than counter-balanced by investing judges with a dispensing power, and by giving legislative sanction to a further invasion of the sanctity of private contract which will infalliby be cited later on by enterprising collectivists and other enemies of existing social order as a reason for hurrying the Deluge.

The following is an extract from the evidence before the Committee :

Mr. Ascroft : Do you know of bills of sale given for large sums ?

Sir George Lewis : Yes. I know of a case in which a lady gave a bill of sale for £5000. The furniture was worth more than that sum, but the lender, after charging £50 for preparing an inventory (for which he should not have received more

than £5), declined to lend the £5000 unless the lady's jewellery and plate were included in the bill of sale. In my judgment, the lady was cheated out of this £50.

The witness complained in particular of the transactions of such firms as that of Samuel Lewis.

He regretted to say that although there were some Christian money-lenders, the bulk of them were Jews. He could say, however, that the Jewish community loathed and despised these men, and refused to allow them to hold any position in their ranks. They were utterly ignored.

Jewish clergymen preached against them and their usurious practices in the synagogue. He thought he might be allowed to make these observations because he knew the circumstances of his own knowledge, he himself being a Jew.

Men [he went on] come over here from Poland and Jerusalem and other places and carry on their usurious practices, and I can assure you they are loathed by the Jewish community. We should be only too glad to see them put down, punished, and imprisoned.

Cases have come before me in which the firm of Samuel Lewis have discounted bills for young men (giving part money and part jewellery) at 60 per cent. or more.

The meaning of that is, that if they discounted a bill for £500 and charged 60 per cent. and deducted 5 per cent. from the bill, and then gave the remaining half in jewellery (on which a profit of 50 per cent. would be charged) the money-lenders would make about £110 per cent.

The first thing the usurers do is to find out the father or relatives of the young borrower, and what is the chance of screwing the money out of them, and the money is lent very

often with the perfect knowledge that the chances are that the father will have to pay.

In the Spender-Clay case we had a young man who had just come into a fortune, and his bills were discounted at 40 per cent. because a young nobleman presented them. Transactions to the amount of £100,000 had taken place.

Fancy what that means at the rate of 40 per cent. for whatever period the bills were given for. Is there anything surprising in a young man being ruined by such transactions?

He had never, in the whole of his long and varied experience, known an instance in which a borrower had obtained an advantage by borrowing, but he had seen many instances in which money-lenders had become rich.

Take the case of Isaac Gordon. He had come to this country from Poland without a shilling, and now, after a very few years, was lending £45,000.

But for the facilities which were given to usurers, and the way in which debtors became entangled in their meshes, so that escape was impossible, the crime for which a young nobleman was now suffering imprisonment would not have been committed.

It is probably well known that no satisfactory definition of the term "money-lender" has ever yet been suggested, but the term is used by money-lenders and the public as a term well understood by everybody. After right consideration the Select Committee of the House of Commons came to the conclusion that the transactions will be sufficiently distinguished by the expression: "Transactions with persons carrying on the business of a money-lender, or in the course of such business."

The two fundamental proposals made to the Select Committee for remedying the evils were :

(1) That Parliament should treat interest above a certain rate on loans advanced by professional money-lenders as irrecoverable at law ; or

(2) That the court should have power to go behind any contract with a money-lender to inquire into all the circumstances of the original loan and of the subsequent transactions, and to make such order as may be considered reasonable.

The Committee, with much good sense, refrained from recommending any statutory limitation of interest.

They recommended, however, that all transactions, by whatever name they may be called, or whatever their form may be, which are in substance transactions with persons carrying on the business of a money-lender in the course of such business, should be open to complete judicial review. This conclusion is supported by the views of a large number of the Indian judges and high officials in India, who have recently been consulted by the Indian Government on the subject of usury, and are in favour of giving discretion to the courts rather than limiting interest or laying down any hard and fast rule.

The registration of money-lenders under conditions set forth is a further recommendation of the Select Committee.

Seeing that the kites and pigeons are unlikely to change their respective natures in consequence of legislation, and that the brains and astuteness of the money-lenders and the necessities of borrowers will

drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament designed to deal with their repulsive trade, it is unlikely that legislation by a mainly Gentile House of Commons will result in any permanent advantage to the community. Reduction in the numbers of the money-lenders and the purification of their character will be brought about, if at all, by other means than legislation, while any considerable addition to the number of Jews already in this country will necessarily increase the number of persons dependent for a livelihood upon the money-lending trade. It is the fashion to treat Jewish emigration as though the emigrants were Huguenots, but if we are to grapple with facts, unfortunately true, the larger proportion of the incomers from Polish and Russian Ghettos are money-lenders by taste and heredity. They only lack opportunity to enter a trade which has done more to injure the Jews, both modern and ancient, than any other occupation they are accustomed to follow.

However great or small the evil of Jewish money-lending in Europe may be, it is a growing evil, and especially in England, public opinion, even Jewish public opinion, has little or no effect upon Jewish money-lenders. Instances have been known when congregations of certain synagogues have refused to permit professional money-lenders to worship in their midst. All honour to such lofty followers of the faith of Moses. But for one Jewish money-lender who is converted from the error of his ways by exclusion from a public synagogue, there are many willing to take any spiritual risk that may be going in order to obtain a fair share of material profits from impecunious Gentiles.

After thus noting the close connection between the Jews and money-lending, even in England, where they are free to follow all careers, notwithstanding the discouragement of certain members of their community, it is interesting to recall the debate in the House of Commons of April 5, 1830, on the introduction of the first Bill to repeal the civil disabilities affecting British born subjects professing the Jewish religion. Nobody now exists who doubts that England acted rightly, though tardily, in finally repealing Jewish disabilities, but the opinions expressed by the opponents of the Bill of 1830, however little in harmony with current thought, were founded on historical facts which cannot be explained away by imputations of ignorance or fanaticism, or excused on the plea that because good Jews abound in free England and the United States bad Jews should be silently suffered to injure their adopted country. Sir Robert Inglis, Member for Oxford University, in the debate of 1830 resisted Jewish emancipation on the ground that the Jews were not patriots. He said: "It was well known that they importantly facilitated the retreat of Napoleon after his campaign in Russia;" also "that while we were at war with France the Jews of London had furnished Napoleon with a loan to enable him to carry on the most determined hostility." After eighty or ninety years of peace it is easy to condemn these utterances as reactionary and illiberal, but the debate took place only fifteen years after the battle of Waterloo, when the events referred to were fresh in men's minds. And it is not certain that if similar practices were to be revealed during a future war with France—a con-

tingency not wholly outside the arena of practical politics—cosmopolitan financiers who amassed wealth by ministering to the wants of our enemies would find Demos less indifferent to the fact than the men of family who governed the country during the last great struggle with France.

In the same debate Mr. Harrison Babley expressed some apprehension as to the political power that would quickly accumulate in Jewish hands. He predicted that "twenty-five Jews would obtain seats in the Commons House of Parliament, and a few of the leading men among them would soon obtain as much influence there as they had already possessed over the 3 per cent. Consols." The latter part of the prediction has already been fulfilled; but, it must be admitted, without visible disadvantage to the community, unless the overwhelming influence of the great Jewish financiers over foreign affairs may be regarded as prejudicial to the higher interests of Britain.

Mr. Percival ignored the money-lending proclivities of the Chosen People and resisted the Bill on religious grounds. He entreated the House "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to preserve the religion of Christianity —the religion of the State—from being defiled by the introduction of the Bill now proposed." In this line of policy he was supported by the Solicitor-General, Sir Nicholas Tindall, who quoted Lord Coke: "They married not with Christians, and entered not into any of those relations with the rest of the community which constituted family ties and were the real bonds of society."

On reviewing this debate, after the lapse of nearly

three-quarters of a century of time, the illiberality and hypocrisy of the religious arguments urged for the exclusion of the Jews from public affairs stand out in vivid contrast with the sincerity and force of the pleas founded on the money-lending proclivities of the race —having regard to the time when they were uttered. The Duke of Wellington, who was Prime Minister, exercised a dominant influence over the public mind, and was what would now be described as an anti-Semite, on the ground of his experience and belief that the loaning and love of money replaced patriotism in the Jewish character. While the Jews were excluded from English citizenship, however, it seems unfair to blame them for feeding the power of Napoleon, especially as he was the only prince in Europe who had begun to do them justice. Oppression and persecution had destroyed their moral tone of character. That it can be revived on regaining the opinion of their fellow-men is plain to all who know something of the Anglicised and Americanised Jews, and the patriotic spirit developed by the magic of freedom and sympathy. On the other hand, it may fairly be urged that free admission to State rights involves the abandonment of such practices as those reprobated by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Inglis. In one of the wars of the last century the Jews were expelled from Bohemia because they had assisted an invading army against their lawful sovereign. Similar outbreaks will assuredly recur in the future if the democracy is confronted with evidence of similar treachery—all excuse for treachery having been removed—no matter whether the assistance given to the enemy be in money or kind.

England and America will remain friendly to the Jews only on condition that the enemies of Anglo-Saxons are not subsidised and aided in time of war from Jewish sources. Although Christianity is part and parcel of the constitution, Parliament is now indifferent to the sworn enemies of Christianity, whether Atheist, Monotheist, or Polytheist. But no Parliament can be indifferent to the considerations which rendered the great Duke of Wellington a convinced, if belated, opponent of Jewish emancipation, considerations which, unfortunately, can scarcely be dismissed as chimerical. There is no danger that good citizens will betray their country, but that bad citizens will bring dishonour upon their race in time of war for the sake of gain, precisely as they have done in time of peace, is a probability of the future that should be anticipated and provided against by the legislature.

# X

# THE DESTITUTE ALIEN IN GREAT BRITAIN

# THE DESTITUTE ALIEN IN GREAT BRITAIN

In foreign and domestic affairs the inhabitants of all countries suffer from the incapacity of their rulers to foresee and provide for meeting dangers that if not palpable at least loom on the horizon. The professional politician in civilised lands, especially when in office, is too much occupied in satisfying the immediate calls on his time in each succeeding day to arrange for the settlement of difficulties which are not of immediate and pressing moment. In Great Britain we have had many instances of the kind. The Destitute Alien Question is one of those subjects which does not lend itself to statistics, and is incapable of being dealt with suddenly or by a rapid and dramatic piece of legislation; and, moreover, it does not injuriously affect the main body of the community. The evil results of alien immigration into this country are concentrated for the present on a small and uncomplaining class, and comparatively few British-born subjects, unless among the poorest aad most nomadic of the dwellers in our great cities, can be said to be the sufferers by the present system. The growth of population and the pressure of existence within these islands, the increasing

size of the great towns, and the diminution of the agricultural population, have long occasioned anxiety among the students of sociology who are in search of remedies for the evil conditions under which handicraftsmen and their families are compelled to toil. The moral, physical, and economical effects of foreign labour—principally of Russian and Polish Jews—in the densely populated and generally overcrowded towns has not received adequate or dispassionate examination.

Thanks to the Huguenots, to the traditions that cluster round the doctrine of the right of asylum, and to the great advantages which our population has derived from previous admixtures of foreign blood, England is the last country in all the world to question the absurd doctrine that the uninterruped entry of foreign men and women, without reference to quality, health, morals, attainments, or condition is advantageous to her national life. Within the last few years, however, the reign of this dogma has not remained unchallenged. England notes that free immigration has now ceased in the United States under the provisions of successive Acts of Congress. In other countries the diseased, the anarchist, the criminal, and the pauper are not admitted. In British colonies themselves the class of foreigners from Polish and Russian slums accepted by London, Leeds, and other large cities every week, would be refused entry. Every effort on the part of the mother country to enforce on the colonies the ingress of people destitute of those virile qualities that make a nation, except genius in fiction and assiduity as intermediaries, would be re-

sisted, if necessary, by insurrection. No one would dream of asking Australians to accept immigrants rejected by the United States of America. In Great Britain ten years ago a House of Commons Committee on Foreign Immigration touched the mere fringe of the subject. The late Mr. Bradlaugh, who on that occasion practically acted as counsel for the Jews, and whose intellectual supremacy and force of will in resisting evidence he disliked were never more conspicuously exhibited than on that occasion, was more concerned in demonstrating that those who wished to regulate immigration were intent on destroying the civil and religious liberty now happily accorded to the Jews, than in bringing out the physical and moral disadvantages of the system now followed in England. The Sweating Committee of the House of Lords which sat at the same time refused to accept direct evidence bearing on the subject. The peers were reluctant to trench on the rights and privileges of the Commons Committee, which, in its turn, was concurrently animated by a similar delicacy in regard to the privileges of the Upper House. The consequence of these inter-Parliamentary courtesies was that while the country believes the subject to have been fairly considered, practically nothing took place of any value but an aimless wrangle on the surface of the Jewish Question. In 1892 I published a book * on the subject, in which I endeavoured to show that the evil was neither slight nor temporary. Since then much has

* "The Destitute Alien in Great Britain: a Series of Papers dealing with the subject of Foreign Pauper Immigration." London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

happened. A society was formed to check the free entry of destitute aliens into Great Britain. Destitute aliens continued to enter without check or limit. When in Opposition the Marquis of Salisbury brought in a Bill in which the question of destitute alien immigration was skilfully entangled with that of the right of asylum given to foreign anarchists, who on our soil are free to plot villainy and to arrange for crime to be subsequently perpetrated in the territory of the Queen's allies. Furthermore, the Labour Department of the Board of Trade took up the question of the statistics of foreign immigration; and on the strength of these figures a school of economists and statisticians, among whom Mr. Charles Booth and Sir Robert Giffen may be named as the most distinguished representatives, scouted the idea of there being any immaterial danger to the working classes of this country from the free entry of Polish and Russian Jews into the ghettos of our great towns. "Let the alarmist sleep easy on his bed," writes Mr. Charles Booth in the first volume of his monumental work on the "Labour and Life of the People." He continues: "Whatever may have been the cause of alarm presented by the immigration of the Jews it is all over now—at least, for the present." In another portion of the same work, however, there is a significant reference to the aloofness of the Jew which would seem to indicate that there is an element in alien immigration that is not explained away by the figures given by the Board of Trade. He says:

The newcomers have gradually replaced the English population in whole districts which were formerly outside the Jewish

quarter. Formerly in Whitechapel, Commercial Street roughly divided the Jewish haunts of Petticoat Lane and Goulston Street from the rougher English quarter lying to the East. Now (1889) the Jews have flowed across the line; Hanbury Street, Fashion Street, Pelham Street, Booth Street, Old Montague Street, and many other streets and lanes and alleys have fallen before them; they fill whole blocks of model dwellings; they have introduced new trades as well as new habits; and they live and crowd together and work and meet their fate almost independent of the great stream of London life surging round them.

Since 1889 further streets and districts have been invaded and occupied by the foreigner, who has neither improved his habits nor abandoned his aloofness.

English Departmental Reports are generally accepted as colourless and impartial statements of facts, untinged by political or economic prejudice, and at all events free from anti-Semite tendencies. For these reasons the Blue Book on Alien Immigration and the published figures of the Board of Trade have been generally received by the public as though they were utterances from Mount Sinai, and the case for the regulation of alien immigration has been so completely destroyed that any one desiring the total stoppage of Russian and Polish Jewish invalids or criminals should be thrust through with a dart or stoned. The fact is, however, that even in so august a sphere as the Labour Department of the Board of Trade a trace of human nature still lingers among occultist statisticians who look to Sir Robert Giffen as the inhabitants of Thibet regard the Grand Llama. If the proper function of a State bureau is to present one side of the case in a strong

light, the Labour Department has done its work well. There is, however, one drawback to this method of supplying the public with the facts and figures necessary in order to form a just opinion as to the character of the immigration. This drawback consists in the fact that it proves too much. If the Board of Trade figures are accurate, the poor English girls, who believe that they are hungry because they have been replaced by foreigners who have taken their work at lower pay, are misguided victims of mere hallucination. Not only, says the Blue Book in effect, is there no competition to speak of between the English people and the Polish and Russian Jews, but the latter form a valuable element in our population, and are to be encouraged rather than excluded, since they have brought us cheap clothing, bad furniture, and worse boots, just as the Huguenots introduced good felt hats, excellent ox-tail soup, and salads in the seventeenth century.

After carefully examining the evidence on both sides I have come to the conclusion that while, on the one hand, the advocates of restriction have been guilty of exaggeration, at all events during the early years of the agitation, the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, on the other hand, has been guilty of something worse. The Department has wholly suppressed, or wilfully ignored, evidence that tells against the conclusion to which it is committed. There is ample material to furnish a *prima-facie* case for further inquiry as to the results of the ever-growing ghettos in our large towns on the welfare of the indigenous population of Great Britain.

With regard, for example, to the numbers of the

immigrants about which the dispute has continually raged, although the matter is one that does not depend upon the immigration being great or small, because, as Mr. Booth wisely says, the newcomers live and crowd together, and work and meet their fate almost independent of the great stream of London life surging around them. The evils of immigration, therefore, if any, are cumulative, if it can be proved that the incomers are not absorbed into the general mass of the community. That they are not absorbed is shown in another part of this work.

With regard to the figures, however, there are five sources of error in the Board of Trade methods of preparing statistics, each of which tells in the direction of artificially "sweating down the figures," to use an expression employed by Lord Salisbury when introducing a Bill into the House of Lords, which he has not found convenient to reintroduce since his accession to power, presumably in consequence of the Jewish veto placed on legislation of the kind:

1. The want of exact returns of immigrant aliens involves resort to guess work (of which the Board of Trade freely avails itself) in order to decide whether the bulk of the aliens leaving us are of the poorest class—and, therefore, fairly to be deducted from the numbers of the immigrants arriving in any given year—or whether they are persons in better circumstances.

Thus, on pages 8 and 22 of the Blue Book, the 33,188 immigrants arriving without through tickets are reduced to less than 6000, partly by the unsupported assumption that the persons leaving are identical with those arriving. If Dives and Lazarus are both foreigners,

it vitiates the statistics of destitute alien immigration to count Dives when he emigrates as being identical with Lazarus who has just arrived. The Board of Trade does not attempt to prove that the emigrant foreigners are not comparatively well-to-do, and the contrary assumption begs the question at issue.

2. The Department deducts from the gross immigration "all the foreign seamen who come to this country as passengers and ship again as crews." According to this no foreign seaman is ever out of work in England, nor do any of them remain here.

3. Recent labour troubles in the United States and elsewhere have largely swollen the number of destitute aliens, who work their passage over here as cattle helpers, cooks, or odd men, and who are discharged, destitute, at the port of arrival. I can nowhere discover that these persons are included in the Board of Trade statistics.

4. The census returns of Russians and Poles are worthless, if, as I am credibly informed is the case, the enumeration was not performed by census officials, but was entrusted to an unchecked and irresponsible body of Jews. The fear of extortion and conscription among the Semitic populations of Eastern Europe is notorious, and it is inconceivable that they suddenly lose this characteristic by settling in British ghettos.

5. The figures themselves are not collected by the Board of Trade. No administrative responsibility is exercised by the Department, and from the results of private checks instituted at various times on incoming vessels at my own cost I have reasonable ground for doubting the accuracy of the figures obtained.

Turning now to material suppressions of fact, it is extraordinary that a Blue Book ostensibly giving the public an impartial view of the alien question should refrain from all mention of the contradiction involved between the Board of Trade assertion that immigration is so small as to be not worth notice, and the fact of a marked increase of alien destitution in this country. The Jewish Board of Guardians admit the task of relieving the Jewish poor "grows heavier and heavier," and that "the duties cast upon it are more than its present resources and staff and premises enable it adequately and efficiently to discharge." The late Baroness de Hirsch, a foreigner, thinks it necessary to leave £120,000 to the Jewish Board of Guardians in London. This is a fact full of significance.

A second example of suppressed facts of material importance is scarcely to be explained on the plea of inadvertence. Vessels are boarded at Gravesend by a customs officer and by a medical officer of the Port Sanitary Authority. Two lists are made out. One of these lists includes the names of those who are unusually revolting in appearance. Why does the Board of Trade suppress the numbers and details of the aliens who are so filthy on arrival as to be recorded on a roll of dishonour? There is such a list; why are its lessons not published? The reason is obvious: it would tell against the official theory.

I will not dwell upon the suppression of Mr. Burnett from the recent Blue Book, but his report of 1888, which then attracted so much attention, has never yet been answered, and his views there expressed have not, to my knowledge, been withdrawn.

Suppressions of fact are even less serious than statements that are not true. The Board of Trade raises public sympathy with the undesirable mendicants and middlemen who come here, by expressly stating (p. 13) that the "certain residuum, principally of Jewish refugees," remains here. All Englishmen wish to maintain England as the asylum of the *bonâ fide* refugee. But the idea that the dregs of Russian cities who remain here are mainly refugees is a fiction concocted in the Labour Department of the Board of Trade. A Royal Commission, or other impartial inquiry, would at once ascertain that not one immigrant in ten even claims to be a refugee. The bulk of immigrants come here, not because Russians persecute them, but because they are hungry and the English are charitable. Russian Jews quickly learn that £120,000 is left in one legacy to a Jewish body in London. The last Jewish loan to Russia is a proof that the heads of the community do not regard as serious the theory of persecution being the cause of immigration. But, in any case, I contend that England is unwise to extend national hospitality to persons belonging to the submerged tenth of other countries, who refuse absorption into our community; and the device of the Board of Trade in calling them "refugees" is an unusual departure from the best traditions of English public offices.

Mr. Votier, member of the Council of the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives, has authorised me to say that the evidence that he gave to the Board of Trade while the Blue Book was in preparation has been entirely suppressed. He regards it as "a piece

ut wholly inaccurate fiction as regards my he boot and shoe trade.

e details challenging the accuracy of the rade Blue Book have been publicly made wo journals of the first rank, as well as in many speeches, without eliciting any reply, I confess that up to the present time I have concluded that they have remained unanswered because the Department is unable to do so. Until these statements are met with something more explicit than the mere *ipse dixit* of some partisan in the Board of Trade, it is only fair to ask candidates for Parliament on both sides, pending further inquiry, to withhold credit from the assertions and conclusions of the recent volume of Gladstonian leaflets, which is numbered C7, 406, in the series of official English Blue Books."

With regard to the quality of the destitute alien, the Russian Jew—who is by no means generally the sort of person who would be considered as a desirable addition to any community—there are, of course, many industrious, even over-industrious, persons who seek a livelihood in this over-populated country; but there are thousands of others who prefer existence without physical exertion, and who are content to live on others untrammelled by considerations of honesty or truth. Certain economic benefits bestowed on Great Britain by the invasion of the Russian Jews may be admitted; but the question for statesmen is whether those advantages are equal to the benefit that the country would derive from the total cessation of the immigration of professional paupers, anarchists, and thieves, who also manage to obtain a footing in this country under a

strained interpretation of the doctrine of the right of asylum.

A well-known expert, Mr. N. S. Joseph, who is one of the ablest, as he is certainly one of the most kind-hearted and broad-minded members of the Russo-Jewish Committee, a few years ago addressed the Visiting and Bureau Department of that charity in terms that deserve public and Parliamentary attention. After stating that "there remain in London at present an enormous number of these immigrants constantly demanding our sympathy and assistance," Mr. Joseph proceeded as follows :

The first difficulty arises from the heterogeneous nature of the refugees. There are some thoroughly capable and industrious, who only need a friendly directing hand to guide them to the means of earning a livelihood ; *others wholly incapable and idle, and who, perhaps, rarely did a day's work in their own country.* There are some fine sturdy specimens of humanity, physically and morally fit subjects for emigration ; others perhaps, fully as deserving of a fresh start in a new country, but so attenuated and weakened by privation and suffering as to be physically unfit for emigration. There are, unfortunately, a large number of poor widows and orphans, and, to our disgrace, it must be added, there are also many deserted wives and children. There are many men who occupied high social, professional, or commercial positions in their own country, and who have arrived here absolutely without means, *and there are thousands of immigrants who cannot be called refugees at all, but who, chronic incurable paupers, have come from Russia or Poland in the hope of getting something from the Russo-Jewish fund, of which they have heard such exaggerated accounts.* Then there are many who in Russia belonged to trades which have practically no existence here, and a still larger number

who were only hawkers and petty dealers. Then there are the sick and the aged, who might or might not have been driven out of their native place. Moreover, there are, as might be expected, the differences resulting from variations in mental and moral constitution and development, the cultured and the semi-barbarous, the truthful and the untruthful, the honest and the dishonest, the intelligent and the unreceptive.

I can, from personal knowledge, corroborate Mr. Joseph's views, and although naturally unwilling to say one word that might hamper the noble efforts of philanthropists, I distinctly assert that neither the House of Commons nor the country has hitherto been frankly dealt with, in reference to the class of Russian who is now settling in London under the shelter of the title "refugee."

The quality of the typical alien immigrant is to a great extent a matter of controversy. His Honour, Judge Bacon, the County Court Judge of Whitechapel, who is concerned in a larger number of cases in which aliens are both defendant and plaintiff than any other judge in the country, has repeatedly complained that false evidence is given in the majority of cases that come before him. In a recent Whitechapel case, in which both parties were Jews, an interesting revelation was made to the public, that they had tried to settle their differences before the Chief Rabbi, who had failed, however, as arbitrator, because the defendant declined to pay the sum awarded. It seems that Dr. Adler is frequently called upon to arbitrate in disputes between foreign Jews, and Judge Bacon approves the practice, because, as he says, the oath administered by the Chief Rabbi is apparently regarded by the foreigners as

more binding than that administered in the Whitechapel County Court.

It is often stated that the increase in the number of aliens is a fiction devised by the opponents of the emigration of destitute aliens. At the St. George's-in-the-East Revision Court in the autumn of 1898, the revising barrister had before him a case which proved very plainly the large increase of the alien—viz., the Jewish population in the district. A successive claim was made by one Charles McCarthy. It was objected to because of the number of the street in which he had recently resided (John Street) not being given. The Liberal gentleman said it was impossible to do this, though formerly John Street was the centre of a large Irish population, but latterly the Irishmen had been ousted by the Jews, who were now in possession of the place. The latter, not content with this, defaced the numbering of the streets by taking off the plates from the street doors, and in their stead substituting figures in chalk and even meat tickets.

The undigested mass of East End Jews must not, however, be judged by the settlement of their quarrels in civil actions before the County Court Judge. In a recent number of the *Contemporary Review* (January 1898) a Jewish tailor's machinist contributes an admirably written article in which he perhaps unconsciously exhibits some of the qualities of the "typical alien immigrant" which he claims to be. Ten years ago such an article would not have been written. To-day the growing power of the Jews is shown by the contemptuous tone of a successful and representative Jew workman towards English artisans. Ten

years hence the Anglo-Saxon will begin to appreciate the consequences of neglecting the indiscriminate entry of undesirable foreigners into these over-populated islands.

The Earl of Hardwicke has introduced a new Bill for the prevention of a destitute alien emigration. Substantially, it is the same measure as that introduced by Lord Salisbury in 1894. The provisions of the Bill, which are not reproduced, dealt with persons dangerous to the country as an organised, political and social community. The arguments employed by the Earl of Hardwicke are more or less of an academic character, as for some years past it has been evident that no legislative measures purporting to deal with the question of alien emigration to this country have the slightest chance of reaching the Statute Book unless either the consent and goodwill of the representatives of the Jewish community are first obtained, or the Jewish Question is raised as a whole. The Jewish community in England, though not numerically strong, control so large a portion of the financial and journalistic power of the country that any Ministry undertaking a joust against the consolidated strength of the Jews would be infallibly unhorsed. Few subjects produce unanimity among the Jews of free England, but the stoppage of alien emigration is one of them. Many interests are concerned. In the first place, there is the cheap labour employed by the sweating masters of the East End of London and the great towns of England. Many of these men have votes; machinery exists for naturalising them and placing them on the register of voters. The representatives of the Jews in Parliament are far

more numerous than the numbers of their co-religionists would warrant, but the Jewish voters, though few, are concentrated, and possess the power in many constituencies to upset or to destroy the chances of the sitting member.

Another influence that is brought to bear against dealing with the destitute alien question is the public opinion of the Jewish community in Eastern Europe. Synagogue opinion in Poland, Galicia, and the provinces of the Russian Pale is definite and clear. The population knows that if the worst comes to the worst they can always turn to England for a home. Every one in the congested district named has heard of the Jewish Board of Guardians, and the reputation of English charity has spread throughout the villages. If any serious attempt, therefore, were made by an English Premier to deal with alien, viz., with Jewish, emigration, a large number of the subterranean and invisible influences would be brought to bear upon the situation, and the Jews of England would stand solid against it, no less at the bidding than at the entreaty of every poor synagogue in Europe.

Another influence that stands in the path of legislation is that the more Jews arriving in England the greater the power of the Jewish community. Already, as I have shown elsewhere, their influence is out of all proportion to their numbers, while the process that is now going on in Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East is one that must necessarily spread from parish to parish, from one constituency to another, until the political influence of the Jewish phalanx in the House of Commons on all such matters as they may be agreed

on will transcend anything that has been known in the history of this country.

It is always a thankless task to speak in warning notes even of the red smoke emerging from a neighbour's chimney, but the constant and growing feeling against the Jews that exists among the English population in the East is a sentiment that no statesman with a claim to prescience can possibly ignore.

When the subject of destitute alien emigration was discussed in the House of Lords in 1894, the peers admitted the principle contained in the Bill, but opposed its further progress on the ground that the emigration complained of was both small and decreasing. The tendency since then has been towards expansion, and this country is now the receptacle of a residuum of the least capable and least efficient citizens of Eastern Europe. If the new arrivals were to spread out over the country in equal proportion, if they were to intermarry with the native born English, and if they did not despise the population among which they settle, their presence would be a matter of comparative unimportance. Concentration in certain districts, refusal to intermarry, separate habits, separate food, separate customs, and a separate day of worship invest the increase of the Jewish community in this country with ominous possibilities.

The following is the draft Bill which I propose should be adopted by Parliament :

AN ACT to amend the Act for the registration of Aliens passed in the sixth and seventh years of his late Majesty William the Fourth.

WHEREAS it is expedient, without in any way impairing the

protection and asylum hitherto accorded to political and religious refugees from other countries, to prohibit the coming into this realm of such alien, unskilled, diseased or incapable paupers as are likely to become a public or private charge, and for that purpose to amend and extend the provisions of the Act for the registration of aliens passed in the sixth and seventh years of his late Majesty William the Fourth, chapter eleven, hereinafter called the principal Act.

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:

1. The master of any vessel which, after the commencement of this Act, shall arrive in this realm from foreign parts, shall not permit the landing of any alien from such vessel at any place within the realm until the said master shall have given to the chief officer of Customs at the port of arrival the declaration in writing required by the second section of the principal Act, nor until he shall have received from the said chief officer permission to allow the landing of the said alien.

2. When the chief officer of Customs has reason to think or suspect that among the aliens on board any such ship there are any unskilled, diseased or incapable paupers or persons likely to become a public or private charge, he shall inquire into the present and probable future means of living of every such alien, and if the result of such inquiry shall satisfy such chief officer of Customs that any such alien will not be able to support himself within the realm by his own means or labour, but that he is from incapacity, disease or any other cause whatsoever likely to become a public or private charge, then the chief officer of Customs shall refuse to permit the landing of such alien pauper, and thereupon it shall be unlawful for the said alien to land or for the master of the vessel to permit him to land in any part of the realm or to permit him to go on

board any other vessel for the purpose of being landed in any part of the realm.

3. Any master of a vessel arriving in this realm from foreign parts who shall contravene any of the provisions of this Act shall be liable for every offence to a penalty not exceeding £100 nor less than £20, and every person, corporation or company knowingly aiding or abetting the commission of any such offence, shall be liable to a penalty of like amount.

4. All offences against this Act shall be prosecuted and all penalties enforceable and recoverable within the time and in the manner prescribed by the principal Act with respect to offences against that Act, and the burden of proving that any person declared by the master of the vessel to be an alien is not such shall be as in the principal Act is prescribed.

5. This Act shall not apply to any fugitive criminal who is exempted from extradition by the Extradition Acts of 1870 and 1873, not to any person who has been expelled from his country or home on account of his religious faith or who has been threatened with persecution on account of such faith, not to any member of the family of any such person accompanying him.

6. The Secretary of State shall appoint some suitable person of the Hebrew faith to act as assessor to the chief officer of the Customs in London. The assessor shall have power to visit any vessel whose destination is London and on board of which any such aliens shall have been declared to be, and may inquire into the main character and history of any such alien, and it shall be for the assessor to determine whether any alien of the Hebrew faith on board who claims to come within the provisions of section five of this Act does come within such section or not. The determination of the assessor on this point shall for the purposes of this Act be final and conclusive.

7. An assessor to the chief officer of Customs at Hull, and

an assessor to the chief officer of Customs at Liverpool, and an assessor to the chief officer of Customs at Leith shall also be appointed by the Secretary of State. Each of such assessors shall be of the Hebrew faith, and shall have as to vessels whose destinations are Hull, Liverpool and Leith respectively and as to aliens on board such vessels, the same powers of visiting and determining as by the sixth section are conferred upon the assessor to the chief officer of Customs in London.

8. In the case of any alien on board any such vessel as aforesaid who is not of the Hebrew faith and who claims to be allowed to land as coming within the provisions of section five, the chief officer of Customs shall require from any such alien full particulars of his name, nationality and last place of abode, and also of the fact or facts by reason of which he claims to come within the said section. Upon such particulars being furnished to him, the chief officer shall permit the landing of the said alien.

Frenchmen, oblivious of Napoleon's teaching, have caught the contagion of Jew-hatred from their recent Russian ally. The microbe of anti-Semitism, though dormant in France for many years, is now in full activity. Mediæval robbery and massacre have disgraced the chief city of Algeria. Antipathy towards the Jew in France, once apostrophised by Victor Hugo as the Christ of nations, has led to the immolation of liberty, the destruction of equality, and sacrifice of fraternal kindness. In the United States, the spacious opportunities afforded to all the inhabitants of the Republic have arrested the growth of dangerous anti-Semitism ; still the feeling is there. American comic papers teem with gibes at the rapacity, the ugliness, and the bad taste of Jewish citizens of the United

States. Taunts and insults are levelled against them, which would be brooked by the men of no other race. Jews are excluded from the *crême de la crême* of New York society, although many Hebrew capitalists, men of science, and others are among the most worthy and generous citizens of the Republic.

In Morocco and Persia misery is the normal condition of existence for the Hebrew population.

Probably no less than eight millions of the Hebrew population of the world drag out an existence of tribulation and anguish. Their numbers are steadily increasing. Extermination, as a remedy for the waxing mighty of the House of Israel, is out of date. Exile is impossible to a people who, wherever they may live, are already exiles.

In contrast to the sea of human woe, in which the destitute Jews of two continents are plunged, is the phenomenon of a well-nigh omnipotent community of opulent Hebrews in all the capitals of Europe. Supreme in international finance, no nation can take any serious step without first securing the concurrence of Israel. When Germany demanded the control of Greek finance, the Concert of Europe, if unanimous about nought else, were agreed in placing the finances of Greece under what is virtually Jewish control. Financial considerations underlie most of the great actions of nations. Cosmopolitan finance is the predominant interest that determines international questions. Cosmopolitan finance is only another name for Jewish finance. No first-rate Christian firm dealing with international finance has existed since the fall of the house of Baring conferred upon the house of

Rothschild a lonely supremacy. In South Africa, the name of no Christian is found in the ranks of those who have amassed large fortunes. Johannesburg is an Anglo-Israelite town. The march of the great Jew houses towards the capture of the wealth of the world advances in geometrical procession, and the day is not far distant when the nations of Europe may suddenly discover that everything belongs to their Jewish fellow subjects; and that, in working, democracy has ignorantly laboured for Jewish supremacy, and has lost the capacity for maintaining a separate national existence. The beginnings of modern anti-Semitism are due to the new appreciation of the growing financial power of the Jewish race.

In England, it is true, the imputation of anti-Semitism is still greatly dreaded, while the charge of being anti-English is regarded as complimentary—being merely equivalent to the imputation of cosmopolitan sympathies. English and American public men are so anxious to avoid the imputation of anti-Semitism, that they never refer to any matter with which the Jews are concerned, such as immigration, education, or charities, without going out of their way to express a sense of the extraordinary value of the Jewish element in the population. Not in all cases are these protestations sincere. Of late years anti-Semitic sentiments are occasionally expressed in English society, when no Jew is present, as in Russia, Roumania, or Paris itself. The avowedly anti-Semitic element in English society is but small. But it is growing. It is scarcely articulate; it has no organ in the press. Still the dislike of the Jews, jealousy of their power, and a sense of the appalling

vigour of their competition, have already combined to produce a state of hostility in Great Britain which runs into many channels of our national life.

Considering the small number of Jews in England—probably not more than 120,000 or 130,000—the influence which they have obtained is an accurate measure of their extraordinary abilities. Ability without manners is the raw material of unpopularity. A recent American writer has quoted the principal of a down-town, east side, primary school in New York, as saying that the children of the Russian and Polish Jews are astonishingly clever :

> I have never met such memories [she says] in any other race. They can learn anything, and apparently without much effort. Little children who have never been to school before come in here to me and pick up the beginnings of an education in two or three days. I never cease to marvel at them. But they have absolutely no manners, and no conception of them.

This combination of brains and boorishness is no essential element in the Jewish character. Persecution tends to the degeneration of a race, though perhaps to the refinement of individuals. Cowper declares that roughness is the "grain of British natures," and if, on the continent, the English have acquired a reputation for bluff discourtesy, which is too often the effect of prosperity on unrefined natures, the same quality so generally marked as existing in the Hebrew community will yield to influences which are already beginning to soften English manners. Education, travel, the constant flow of new ideas conduced by a cheap and well-conducted press, have revolutionised the behaviour of

British crowds within the last quarter of a century. There is hope that the introduction of similar educational influences will yield no less favourable results in the case of the Jewish people. At present, however, the signs of softened manners among the Hebrew population are not conspicuous.

The various considerations affecting the popularity of the Jews set forth in the foregoing pages have not escaped the notice of Jewish writers and teachers. The question "Are Jews Unpopular? If so, Why?" has been publicly discussed in the Jewish press. The interest of the discussion arises from the fact that the statements made are with a single exception—that of the contribution of the present writer—those of Jews themselves.

There is little doubt [says the editor of *Young Israel*, May 1898], however, that the average Jew is not liked by the average Gentile. For this there must be a reason, and our people have always, in the general way, set the reason to the detriment of the Gentile. Our correspondent, who writes with authority, offers a different version, and at least a reasonable one.

The following is the material portion of the letter referred to:

There are, of course, notable exceptions, but it is mere commonplace amongst Christians to say that the ordinary behaviour of the average Jew is atrocious. He is bumptious, self-conceited, arrogant, pushing, loud-mouthed and overbearing, whilst his manners are generally clumsy, *gauche* and unrefined. These are awkward characteristics to be possessed by a people who freely mingle with those who pride themselves

upon their good nature and their good breeding according to their lights. These then possibly might account for some contempt or disdain felt towards the Jew, but even they do not account for the sort of dislike which animates the average Gentile. For, of course, these are but surface defects, which education and polish will in time remedy.

There are deeper reasons. In the first place, the characteristic Jew, in his trading operations, or in his professional practice—if professional he be—is universally found by Christians to be none too scrupulous. I know it is easy enough to retort, and to say that there are black sheep in every flock, and that Jews do not give an excessive proportion of those made amenable to the law for fraudulent practices. But the sort of unscrupulousness which is complained about is not always that of which the law can take cognisance. It consists, in the main, in a kind of sharp practice, in a total ignoring of those amenities of honourable understanding between man and man, the nice give and take, which form a code, albeit unwritten, often more stringently binding upon the consciences of right-seeing people than the strict laws of the land. For instance, let one happen to make a bargain with a Jew which turns out to be to the Jew's disadvantage. The Jew will wriggle and contrive, and delve and devise all and every means for backing out of it. But let the same bargain be to the Jew's advantage and to the other's disadvantage, the Jew then will hear nothing of misunderstandings or mistakes, and care nothing for ignorance or weakness or stress of circumstances; a bargain is a bargain then, and must be adhered to. Hence it follows that the Jew's word is not found to be quite as good as his bond, and his bond only worth what you can strictly hold him to. This is, perhaps, graving the characteristics in deep lines; but this same spirit —get out of a bad bargain, stick like a limpet to a good one, throwing every other consideration of means and circumstances

and conditions to the winds—is the spirit that animates the Jew—more or less and in varying degrees, of course—in all his relations whereby he earns whatever income he makes. This disposition, as I say, may take various forms. In the money-lender it takes one, in the vendor of spurious jewellery it takes another, in the sweater it takes another, and in the blackleg workman it takes another; but, whatever the form, the spring-root of sharp practice is traceable. I doubt not most of your readers, being Jews, will think this denunciation of their earning practices all too severe. I shall not be surprised if they do, because they cannot know much about it. For the Jew, in the main, prefers not to deal with the Jew; and, when he does, he behaves quite differently from when he deals with the non-Jew. The non-Jew he always sets down as fair game for spoil.

There are other causes for unpopularity, and, although I note them, I do not altogether sympathise with them, and I mention them only because I think that great good might be done by mitigating and modifying them, as far as we can consistently with our loyalty to our faith. Gentiles, of course, cannot regard with feelings of geniality a people who hold themselves not alone ostentatiously separate, but who also hold Christians with a sort of lofty contempt. I was present the other day when a lady wrote a refusal to an invitation that had been sent to her daughters to a party to a Christian friend's. I asked her why she had refused to let her daughters go, and she had no better objection than this: "No, thank you. I don't let my girls go out dancing with a lot of Christian young men. They always take too much to drink at supper you know." This is but an example of the manner in which the Jew regards the Christian socially; but it finds its counterpart in many other directions. For instance, in our prayers we find such phases as "He hath not made us like the nations of other lands, and hath not placed us like other families of

the earth. He hath not assigned unto us a portion like theirs, nor made our lot like all their multitude." I have selected this, since it is taken from the prayer which is, perhaps, more frequently recited than any other; but it is only one instance of much written in the same spirit that runs through our Liturgy. I *know* that the average Jew, since he says this in Hebrew, either does not understand what he says, or says it so mechanically as not to realise its true import; but the Christian cannot take account of this. He finds it in the Jewish Prayer-book, and he naturally supposes that the Jew, when he utters it, means what he says, and says it with devotion and spiritual energy. Can we be surprised if Gentiles do not feel a loving regard for a people who thus show their desire to monopolise the whole of God to themselves, a crassness in so localising to themselves His infinite powers, or who evince such a reckless disregard of altered conditions as is shown, by way of further example, once a year during the Passover Home Service, in the "impolicy of the Open Door"?

"An English Jew" contributes the following to the discussion:

Jews are certainly unpopular. I would differentiate between the unpopularity that arises from historical compelling causes over which we have had little control and the unpopularity which is but the mirror of the community as it is.

When the Jewish nationality broke up and the race was distributed, among other places, all over the continent of Europe, Jews were unpopular for the following inevitable reasons: (1) They were intruders. (2) They were associated with the responsibility for the martyrdom of Jesus of Nazareth, upon the tragedy of which was founded the Christian faith in the countries where they sought a refuge. (3) They remained Oriental in the Western World. (4) They were exclusive and cliquey. (5) What little desire there was on their part to

associate and assimilate was crushed out of their hearts by the cruel repressive legislation with which they were everywhere met.

The whole of the modern question can be gathered into the scope of a nutshell if, looking at these five points, we realise that the world has largely outgrown the feeling that prompted the first four on my list and the Jew has not recovered the partly excusable effects of the cruelty referred to in my fifth contention.

Having been forced into narrow grooves of unpopular occupation, Jews have kept to the unpopular occupations to a large extent when the necessity of confining themselves to them has passed away, notoriously in the matter of money-lending and usury. I am convinced that if we could get rid of the stigma of usurious money-lending, we should rid ourselves of the greatest cause of Jewish unpopularity. Unfortunately literature has made the picture of the usurious Jew lasting, in some cases immortal, but we could effect something like a change for the better if we took up a bold stand against the money-lending which, though not confined to our community, besmirches us infinitely out of proportion to the share that Jews really have in this most noxious of occupations. It may be, sir, that a community has no power to interfere with the private affairs or the public character of individuals. But I regret to have to say that we Jews are so fond of money that we cannot pluck up the courage to denounce its possessors, and to refrain from giving them honours that make the Christian onlooker sometimes inclined to think that the prosecution of a nefarious trade is almost a qualification for the conferment by the synagogue of office and honours. . . .

I will, after having taken up already so much of your valuable space, advert to but one more phase of Jewish unpopularity. Why are so many Jews so ostentatiously and vulgarly showy? Why do people give noisy card parties and

dances on Sundays? Why do Jews wear so many diamonds in the stalls of the theatres, all the Jews, all the showy dress, and all the showy diamonds congregating together on one spot, as it were? Why do so many Jews go to Margate in the summer? Why, when there, do they sit in all their finery at their open windows? Why do they talk so loudly everywhere about their money and their dress, and (faugh!) about their food? Why is it possible to tell a Jewish boarding-house on a Sunday, not by the Mezuzzah on the door, but by the noise within, and the card playing for many hours, with all the blinds up and all the lights on? Why—but I have asked enough for once. When these questions are answered I will ask more.

"Kaffa" gives a fresh view:

When I say there is a prejudice against foreign Jews, I do not mean the victims of persecutions, many of whom shed lustre on the Jewish name, but rather the German Jews, possessed of some means, who come over here and set up in some already overcrowded business.

It may seem a strong statement, but I do not think there is a more objectionable creature on the face of the earth than the average German Jew who comes to settle in England.

The explanation is not difficult. It is only those who do not get on at home who come over here. We are made a sort of sanitary dust-bin. I have had exceptional opportunities of seeing every class of Jews under all sorts of circumstances, and my impression is, that Jews, born of English parents, have much the same virtues and vices as any other Englishmen of the same social position.

Another writes:

The difference in religion has nothing whatever to do with the unpopularity of the Jew. The Christian respects the

observant Jew. It is only those who, while professing Judaism, bring disgrace on the community by their practice of *no* religion who receive and *merit* his contempt.

My own contribution to the discussion was as follows:

I was somewhat surprised at receiving an invitation from the editor to contribute to the discussion on "Are Jews unpopular? If so, Why?" The question is as unanswerable as "Are Women Truthful?" or "Do Doctors understand Disease?" The question seems to me to be one that will never be settled by public discussion. Every one will form his own opinion. Within the limits of such knowledge as I have on the subject I should say that Jews, as a class, are unpopular, but that much of their unpopularity is due to no fault of their own; and many Jews are highly popular. People who are successful, sedentary, and of alien origin, could scarcely be anything but unpopular amongst insular, thriftless, active, full-blooded, and meat-eating Englishmen, lacking precisely the qualities in which the Jewish community generally excels. "The Aloofness of Israel," as I have ventured to term one characteristic of the Hebrew community, is another reason why popularity has not been obtained. Different diet, unwillingness to intermarry with Gentiles, and separate worship, are three further reasons for the failure of the bulk of the Jewish element in our national life to obtain popularity. Racial pride not seldom leads good Jews of the poorer classes to show contempt for the people by whom they are surrounded. Mr. Dyche's article in the January *Contemporary Review* is a case in point. The close connection, both by blood and faith, of English Jews with an alien community in other countries is another bar to popularity. The English are historically averse to foreign influence. To sum up: popularity is not accorded by the common English people to a race or a portion of a race whose

diet is different to their own, whose origin is Oriental, and whose ties with co-religionists of the same race inhabiting other countries are closer than with Britons, and who, except in the comfortable classes, for successive generations have declined to intermarry with the nationals of their adopted country.

On the other hand, the powerful and interesting letter of J. E. W. seems to me unjust, inasmuch as the reasons given by the writer for Jewish unpopularity are not set off against the reasons for Jewish popularity. These are many, and should always be stated whenever the opposite view is set forth. I have met in my time many anti-Semites, but I rarely discuss the Jewish question with any of them without hearing an admission from their lips that, although antipathetic to the race, some bosom friend is sure to be a Jew or a Jewess. There are, therefore, a large number of Jews whose sympathy, exquisite refinement of mind, delicate perception, intellectual power, and social charm make them the most delightful of human beings, and distinguish them among people of a coarser fibre. The number of such Jews is palpably on the increase in England as education spreads and the spirit of the Jewish religion is shed abroad. I have always looked to the absorption of the Jewish element in English national life as essential both to the welfare of England and to the popularity of the Jews, for I regard the outbreak of further anti-Semitic trouble on the Continent as certain to convert England into a sanctuary for the persecuted Jewish race all over the world. If the Jews will consent to be absorbed and to mingle their blood with ours, all will be well; but if not, the unpopularity of the foreign Jews is likely to increase. The strength of the Jewish community in proportion to their numbers is already great, and should Jewish influence grow rapidly, its wealth increase, and numbers multiply owing to greatly increased immigration, I should not be surprised to watch unpopularity ripen into jealousy, and even hate, among the common people.

It would hardly be fair to close even these few words on Jewish unpopularity without referring to the splendid services, both to England and to Israel, performed by Sir George Lewis in his stand-up fight against the money-lending sharks. The action of Sir George Lewis—skilled, courageous, timely—has, to my knowledge, made a deep impression upon many persons of influence with whom the Jews were unpopular. For a man in Sir George Lewis' position to throw himself almost single-handed against a great national abuse is a service to his fellow countrymen which is not likely to be forgotten. If only Sir George Lewis, and those who think with him, could overcome the aloofness of nine-tenths of the Jewish immigrants of the last thirty years, there would be no Jewish Question brewing in England.

# XI

# ZIONISM

# ZIONISM

THE colonisation of Palestine has long been a dream of idealistic Jews, and has recently, in the form of Zionism, taken a more or less practical shape. A few small colonies in the Holy Land have been established at great cost by the liberality of Jewish millionaires, but the practical result of all that has been done to restore the Jews to the Holy Land is really nothing. Until thirty years ago the Jews in Palestine were very few in number, probably to be reckoned by hundreds rather than thousands, but the Russian persecutions have increased the Jewish element in the population to such a point that visitors to Jerusalem are surrounded by an impoverished and mendicant Jewish crowd. The Holy Land is an arid and comparatively unfruitful country, not much larger than Wales. Jewish colonists who mostly depend on agriculture for a living must, therefore, be placed in proximity to a market or a port. Jerusalem and the larger towns are already overcrowded by destitute Jews, who cling to centres of populations with hereditary tenacity. Communications in the Holy Land are deficient, and, unless railways and canals are supplied, it is impossible that colonists can either raise their products at a low price

or export them with profit. In time, when the increase in population of towns raises a demand for manufactured goods, industries for which there is now no demand would possibly grow up, but before any systematic settlement of Jews in Palestine can be accomplished the construction of roads and railways must precede them.

No colonisation has passed completely beyond the charitable or experimental stage until the colonists are self-supporting. I do not know any Jewish colony which ever has become fully self-supporting, as there are outstanding debts even on the colonies of Ekaterinoslaw. The political differences in the way of a restoration of Israel to the Holy Land are by no means the least of the obstacles to be encountered. Jewish emigration is again forbidden by the Sultan Abdul Hamed, and although Moslem power, since the expulsion from Spain, has proved kinder to the Jews than the Christianised Russians, it is evident that the future of the Holy Land is destined to undergo considerable changes which may not be favourable to the growth of an Israelitish population. The increasing poverty of the Turkish dominions, the panting ambitions of Germany for an outlet for her redundant population, and the known antipathy of the Emperor William to the Jews, all tend to this view.*

But Germany is not the only Great Power with its eye on the reversion of the Holy Land. France claims

* It is within my knowledge that during a visit to Cowes the Emperor William refused permission to the Prince of Wales to present to his Imperial Majesty a Jewish gentleman, who was not only a personal friend of his Royal Highness, but was actually in the room waiting to be presented.

to be hereditarily the protector of Eastern Christians, while Russia will certainly never yield the custody of the Holy Place to a rival, or even to a partner, without a struggle. With the exception of Kieff, there is no sacred shrine for the orthodox of the Greek Church other than that of Jerusalem. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem and to Kieff is almost as obligatory upon the members of the Russian branch of the Eastern Church as the *Haj* to Mecca is binding on the faithful Moslem.

The stir and enthusiasm that has been raised throughout Europe among the poorer Jews in favour of a restoration of the scattered tribes to their ancient home is still, therefore, but a Ghetto dream. Resolutions are passed, enthusiasm is aroused, a bank is projected, subscriptions invited, but all to no purpose. Rich Jews are hostile to an idea which would wrench them from their positions of comfort and luxury and surround them with the society they most eagerly shun. The palaces of the wealthiest Jews may be searched in vain for humble Hebrew guests, and in the event of a Jewish State being established the applications for the appointment of Jewish ambassadorships in London and Paris would be embarrassing to the Executive.

The only ray of light apparently visible for the hopes of those poor Jews whose home instincts have been touched by their own exceeding misery and the enchanting prospects opened out to them by Dr. Hertzl and Dr. Nordau is in the neutralisation of Palestine after Armageddon has taken place.

That the national idea is an essestial and an integral

part of the Zionist movement, and that it is the duty of all Jews to unite in order to secure a legally safeguarded resettlement of the Jewish nation in Palestine, is the principle eagerly accepted by the continental, American, and English Zionists, and is earnestly rejected and opposed both by the rich Jews, who are content with their adopted countries, and by the religious idealists, who look on Judaism purely from a spiritual and not from a racial point of view.

The political movement inaugurated by Dr. Hertzl and Dr. Nordau for the restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land, which continues to be the subject of serious division between the well-to-do and the destitute Jews, seems likely to have further developments early in the new century. The first Congress was held at Bâsle on August 29, 1897, and the second on August 28, 1898. Some two hundred European delegates were present.

In his "Dreamers of the Ghetto" Mr. I. Zangwill has painted a masterly pen-picture of the Congress of 1897:

A strangely assorted set of leaders, but all with that ink-mark on the brow which is as much on the Continent the badge of action as it is in England the symbol of sterility, all believing, more or less naïvely, that the pen is mightier than the millionaire's gold.

Only one of them hitherto has really stirred the world with his pen-point—a prophet of the modern, preaching "Woe! woe!" by psycho-physiology; in himself a breezy, burly undegenerate, with a great grey head marvellously crammed with facts and languages, now to prove himself golden-hearted and golden-mouthed, an orator touching equally to tears or

laughter. In striking contrast with this quasi-Teutonic figure shows the leonine head, with its tossing black mane and shoulders, of the Russian leader, Apollo turned Berserker, beautiful, overpowering, from whose resplendent mouth roll in mountain thunder the barbarous Russian syllables.

And even as no two of the leaders are alike, so do the rank and file fail to resemble one another. Writers and journalists, poets and novelists and merchants, professors and men of professions—types that once sought to slough their Jewish skins, and mimic, on Darwinian principles, the colours of the environment, but that now, with some tardy sense of futility or stir of pride, proclaim their brotherhood in Zion—they are come from many places; from far lands and from near, from uncouth, unknown villages of Bukowina and the Caucasus, and from the great European capitals; thickliest from the pales of persecution, in rare units from the free realms of England and America—a strange phantasmagoria of faces. A small, sallow Pole, with high cheek-bones; a blonde Hungarian, with a flaxen moustache; a brown, hatchet-faced Roumanian; a fresh-coloured Frenchman, with eyeglasses; a dark, Marrano-descended Dutchman; a chubby German; a fiery-eyed Russian, tugging at his own hair with excitement, perhaps in prescience of the prison awaiting his return; a dusky Egyptian, with the close-cropped curly black hair and all but the nose of a negro; a yellow-bearded Swede; a courtly Viennese lawyer; a German student, with proud duel slashes across his cheek; a Viennese student, first fighter in the University, with a coloured band across his shirt front; a dandy, smelling of the best St. Petersburg circles; and one solitary caftan-Jew, with ear-locks and skull-cap, wafting into the nineteenth century the cabalistic mysticism of the Carpathian Messiah.

Who speaks of the Jewish type?

The political Zionist movement in London has met

with extraordinary success among immigrant foreign Jews. A meeting at Mile End Assembly Hall, at which resolutions were enthusiastically passed, has attracted much attention and created further division in Jewish ranks. The resolution passed at the Zionist meeting by more than six thousand foreigners was represented to be the opinion of *English* Jews, although the English and Anglicised element was conspicuously absent and the assemblage was obviously composed of aliens. Much complaint was aroused against the circle of the Jewish community by the attempt to make it appear that seven thousand Englishmen were prepared to follow Dr. Hertzl. Whether English or foreign, however, the present condition of Zionism in England has passed the stage of doubt. Notwithstanding all the enthusiasm aroused by the eloquence and sincerity of its founders, the political Zionistic movement is irretrievably doomed. The Zionistic heart beats tumultuously and hands are stretched out to seize the Promised Land, while the coming Canaan is floated among the Chosen People in £1 shares.*

* The financial experts decline to treat the prospectus of the Trust seriously, and dismiss it contemptuously. The objections are pretty well summarised in the following remarks made by the *Financial News*: "Failing the aid of the Jews whose names are synonymous with financial and administrative capacity, the Jewish Colonial Trust is headed by a strange assembly of bankers and manufacturers from Pinsk and Dwinsk and Jassy, and other remote places undistinguished as centres of light and leading. Excellent men they are, no doubt, full of racial enthusiasm; but they are not the persons to be entrusted with £2,000,000 of English capital, or even a tithe of the sum. There is no guarantee that they are capable of administering such sums, no proof that they can prevent the corrupt use of the money. You cannot govern a colony whose nucleus has had its *morale* undermined by years of subsistence on charity, through directors dotted over inconsiderable

The publicity accorded to this movement has aroused the apprehension of the Turkish Government. The Sultan is alarmed. With much rigour Abdul Hamed is now enforcing restrictive measures against the Jews entering Palestine. The Ottoman Government refuses registration of title deeds of land held by Jews. The operations of the great philanthropist, Baron Edmund de Rothschild, are alleged to be impeded. If Palestine ever had a small outlet for the alleviation of Jewish suffering it has been closed, and the endeavour to snatch at political shadows has gone far to destroy the only substance that Jewish migration to the Holy Land ever possessed. Whenever the Jews return to Palestine or its Hinterland, it will only be with the goodwill of nations which are now ready to fly at each other's throats. Turkish apprehension, Russian antipathy,

towns in Russia or Roumania, even though there be a head office in London. Nor does the council of twenty give any stronger security, drawn, as it is, from New York to Warsaw, from Paris to Ekaterinoslaw, and from towns in Galicia whose names are as unfamiliar, even if they are not so unpronounceable, as those of the councillors themselves. The promoters do not attempt to demonstrate that profitable industries can be acclimatised in Palestine, and their programme is as vague as their sentiments are fantastic. If money is to be spent for the succour of poor Jews, either in Palestine or elsewhere, we should prefer to see it administered through the agency of the Anglo-Jewish Association or the Alliance Israelite, which are frankly charitable. Were it not that the Jews who find the sinews of war for these beneficent organisations know the futility of this Jewish Colonial Trust, there might be some anxiety lest their sources of supply might be interfered with by the promotion; but that risk is small. The Trust will fade away like other dreams, leaving the burden of Jewish philanthropy on the old shoulders. It is a pity that the Jewish people should be misrepresented, as they are, by the hairbrained and irresponsible promoters of this ridiculous Trust. No one can take seriously this request that Gentiles should subscribe to transport Jews wholesale to where they cannot earn a livelihood, and may be the cause of endless political complications."

German ambitions, French suspicions, and British interests at present work against the embodiment of the Jewish dream.

The magnificent vision of a Jewish State seems to have confused the originators of the Zionist scheme. Dr. Hertzl's religious detachment enables him to speak with scorn of the spiritual aspect of Jewish separateness, which constitutes to the religious Jews the most attractive feature of their faith. With the Jewish message to the nations political Zionism has no sympathy. They do not look upon Israel as a spiritual force. The Bâsle scheme is looked on purely as a check to the Drumonts and the Stöckers. The Jews who cheer Dr. Hertzl have no ambition to be the despised dependants of a predominant Islam. In their heart of hearts they seek a State as well as a home. The Jewish State has been for all time the butt of Jewish wit among the well-to-do. When six thousand foreign Jews gathered in the great hall of the East End of London to hear the Modern Joshua, the Jews of Belgrave Square and Piccadilly, the inhabitants of Maida Vale, the Chief Rabbi, and the upper-class Hebrews were absent with one consent. It was a gathering of the masses, a foreign throng, and still remains an alien movement.

# XII

# "DARKEST RUSSIA"

## "DARKEST RUSSIA"

*Darkest Russia* was a paper brought out between July 15, 1891, and August 11, 1893, and was the organ of the Jewish community of Western Europe for the purpose of protesting against the treatment of the Russian Jews by their Emperor and Government. It is questionable as to how far public opinion in Europe and America was formed and guided by the journal in question. Its historic interest, however, is undoubted, for its columns contained downright denunciations of Russia and the Russians written with full knowledge and signal ability by men who felt as they ought to feel on the subject of the oppression and degradation of their race.

Six numbers of this remarkable periodical appeared in 1891; six in 1892; after that there were no more published until February 1, 1893. The two final issues were on June 1, 1893, and on August 11 in the same year. The peculiarity of the situation consists in the fact that *Darkest Russia* was entitled "a journal of persecution," and was issued by a committee consisting of some of the most enlightened and influential Jewish bankers and business men in Western Europe. The journal was

published periodically with the object of bringing to the civilised world authentic facts relating to Russia's persecution of her Jewish and other nonconformist subjects. It is hoped that public opinion, which has already freely expressed itself in words of solemn protest, may continue to exercise its potent influence and tend to alleviate and eventually stay those cruel deeds of persecution which disgrace the present age.

*Darkest Russia* is suspended, and public opinion is more intent on friendship with the Russian Government than desirous of reprobating the treatment of the Tsar's Jewish subjects.

If only the uncompromising attitude of the Western Jews had steadfastly maintained until to-day its influence on public opinion, there is little doubt that the persecutions of the Jewish community in the Pale would by this time have been materially affected for the better. Russia could have borrowed no money, and Jewish bankers would have been ashamed to make fresh loans to the secular enemy of their race. The fascinations of profit, however, were too great for them to resist, and by a curious coincidence the protest came to an end just at the time when loan-mongering was resumed.

The outburst of Jewish indignation at Russian tyranny was no less surprising than severe. Denunciation of Russia by rich Jewish bankers and others was in itself a courageous act; to have followed up anonymous denunciation and the effusion of ink by a financial boycott would have been a form of intrepidity for which there is no record in the annals of cosmopolitan finance.

The following extracts from this remarkable publica-

tion are of permanent interest for two reasons: firstly, because they are the authentic and deliberate opinions of the best representatives of Western Judaism; and, secondly, because the evils described and denounced not only continue unchecked until this hour, but are aggravated by the increasing pressure of a population which has grown apace since the day when *Darkest Russia* was discontinued.

What should be the attitude of the civilised world [asks *Darkest Russia*—the representative of the Russo-Jewish Committee] in the presence of the cruel war of extermination waged against these unarmed millions of human beings? It should be an attitude of disgust and indignation. Public opinion in every enlightend nation should regard Holy Russia as the enemy of humanity, the bane of progress, the destroyer of true religion.

Russia has posed as the harbinger of civilisation in the East, while she herself has not the bare elements of civilisation even in her own capital. . . .

What sort of civilisation she would bring in her wake if suffered to spread eastward, westward and southward, at her own sweet will, we may discern within her own frontiers. For the Russian war against the Jews is no isolated act of barbarism. She persecutes the Lutherans, though to a less degree, for she fears the rage of Lutheran Germany. . . .

She defies all principles of mercy and justice by her atrocities in Siberia, murdering in cold blood defenceless prisoners, and flogging to death noble-hearted, tenderly nurtured women. Russia then must be regarded as the standing menace to civilisation and progress and the world must wage a crusade against her. Her sons, wherever met, must be reminded that in spite of this thin veneer of Parisian culture, they are members of a barbaric community, that their government is

the incarnation of inhumanity, intolerance and irreligion, and that their institutions and laws are subjects of loathing and contempt to the civilised mind. This should be the attitude of the world to Russia and the Russians.

These sentiments, however fleeting, reflect honour upon the heart and common sense of the Jewish community. They were not, however, found to be inconsistent with a large Jewish loan to "the incarnation of inhumanity, intolerance and irreligion," and the complete cessation of any attack upon the "barbaric community" who are still persecuting with equal rigour a larger number of helpless Jewish families than in 1891.

The emotions of the Western Jews, however—bankers and philanthropists—were not exhausted by an appeal to the civilised world for a social boycott against the Muscovite race. They continue in Cambyses vein :

Perhaps the iniquity of the Muscovite is not yet full. But the day will come when statesmen will ask, "Why should Russia exist?" At the next Berlin Congress, after the great impending struggle, when the unwieldy Empire of the North will lie prostrate in the dust, her finances bankrupt, the bubble of her prestige burst, that will be the question.

The significance of these sentences is scarcely to be overrated. *Darkest Russia* was not an ordinary newspaper. It was the organ, as I have said, of the master spirits of the Jewish community. They knew what they were writing about. The ghastly subject of the persecutions was familiar to them. The first article that was published was probably carefully considered by a committee. Whether this was so or not the

worthies of the Russo-Jewish Committee were responsible for these words. They were acquainted with the political and international situation. They knew that the Russian Empire was unwieldy, that her prestige is a bubble, that her finances would break down under the strain of a great war, that she would lie prostrate in the dust, that her destiny is to be beaten in conflict with any first-class Power; and yet, knowing all these things, they suffered the bankers and high money-lenders to bolster up the Power that was then and now is busy in procuring the degradation and the destruction of unarmed millions of defenceless Jews. It was not that the Western Jews did not feel the iniquity of the Russian loan. Many of them were cut to the quick by the sufferings of their co-religionists. They were silent when the time came to decide whether their brave words should be followed up by effective deeds because of the solidarity that binds the Jewish community with a force derived from two millenniums of united action.

It is owing to the Jews themselves, the rich Jews of the West, that the sentiment of Western Europe against persecuting Russia has died out. Russia is guilty of deeds of the same class and in the same rank as those which are held by British Liberals to disgrace the unspeakable Turk. Mr. Gladstone in August 1891 advised "those who are responsible for these pages," that is, *Darkest Russia*, to present in proper form the facts of the persecution and to deliver their artillery against "the citadel of wrong." The artillery was duly delivered, but was withdrawn at the moment when the breach was about to become practicable.

Mr. Gladstone's advice was taken by the Jewish community. The following language was issued to the world as a form in which the Jewish protest was to be taken:

But how can the strong pressure of public opinion be applied? This time the "sick man" is not an effete monarchy. The "sick man" is, in the present instance, not only strong and vigorous, but he vaunts his brute force as superior to all other Powers in the world. The owner of a million and a half of fighting men may well be allowed to boast, though there is an inherent weakness in armies of such unwieldy magnitude, especially under a *régime* of peculation and corruption. But even to Russia brute force is not everything. No nation, however powerful, can live in isolation. She must have allies, if not for self-defence, at least for friendly concert.

Russia is no exception to this rule. Curiously enough, she seeks her friends, not among despotisms like her own, but in the homes of free republics. It would seem as if Nature, true to her far-reaching principles of polarity, whereby extremes and opposites unite, seeks to strike a golden mean between the wild will of the people and the mad will of the autocrat. Else why the Platonic friendship between Russia and the two great Republics of France and the United States? Not for self-defence; for neither would lift hand or sword to save the other in the day of peril. The civilities of Cronstadt will count for little in the day of tribulation, when the fate of a nation trembles in the balance.

No, even barbarian Russia has a sentiment. She must have friends. She desires to be considered as other nations. Hence she has institutions for education and culture apart from civilised States, exotic perhaps just now, but yet with fair promise for the future, when she shall have outgrown the barbarism of her wild youth. Hence she is sensitive, too

sensitive perhaps, of foreign regard, and the opinion of the outer world is to her what conscience is to civilised nations.

When, therefore, Mr. Gladstone expresses the hope that public opinion, in regard to the persecution, may operate on the sentiment of Russia and of its government, it is because he knows full well how deeply, in spite of her delarations to the contrary, she feels the force of external opinion, and how greatly she resents the imputation that she is still in a barbaric stage of existence.

There remains yet another point in Mr. Gladstone's letter which possesses great significance. He declares that "it is on the Continent that opinion has more need of being helped onwards than in England." This is unfortunately but too true, and it applies first and foremost to France. In England there is but one opinion as to the persecutions, and that opinion has been expressed in no uncertain voice. But Russia has always regarded this country as her hereditary foe, so she cannot be expected to lend a willing ear to her counsels or remonstrances. Germany is only just emerging from a wave of anti-Semitism which has disgraced her, so it would ill become her to preach to her neighbour to avoid the excesses to which she herself was lately addicted. The German Press has not failed in its duty to humanity, and the Austrian Press has been loud in its denunciation of the wrongs inflicted by Russia on the Jews. But the German and Austrian Press counts for little in St. Petersburg and Moscow, where anything spoken or written in the hated German tongue is regarded as an insult. But with France and the French it is different. Let the embraces of Cronstadt bear testimony.

France can do much to quell the persecution of the Russian Jews. She can point out the significant fact that it was by the act of Napoleon I., when absolute, that the Jews of France were emancipated, after a fair and impartial inquiry as to their

creed, their customs, their manners, their morals, and their attitude to the State. She can tell the Tsar that she has never had cause to regret the admission of the Jews to equal rights, and she can show fair evidence of the benefit they have conferred upon the State.

It is the privilege of friendship to be frank and truthful. Will France do the part of the candid friend, and represent to Russia that persecution is not compatible with civilisation?

It fell to my lot to proceed to Russia as Baron Hirsch's representative, to conduct the negotiations with the Tsar's Government which led to free permission being accorded to the Jewish subjects of Russia to leave the country and reside in colonies prepared for them through a munificence unparalleled in the history of charities.

In the course of my negotiations a fact became apparent which any one might have known beforehand, that the unmeasured verbal abuse of Russia by the Jewish community in England, and a futile meeting they had persuaded the then Lord Mayor to convene at the Guildhall, so far from assisting, retarded and hindered the negotiations. I accordingly represented strongly the unwisdom of continuing the denunciation of Russia at the very moment when favours were being asked of the Tsar's Government on behalf of his Jewish subjects; but the fine fury of the Western Jews against Russia was too sincere and irrepressible to suffer abatement in consequence of diplomatic considerations. They refused to remain silent, although the publication in which their diatribes appeared was not allowed to pass the Russian frontier. When asked to cease this publication, at all events temporarily,

in the interests of the sufferers, what was the answer ?

No. The Russia which at the moment governs the vast empire must learn the opinion which enlightened humanity entertains of her acts. She must be told that no Christian nation can grasp her hand while she persecutes her subjects and expels her aliens in the sacred name of religion ; that civilised men regard war against defenceless multitudes as a curse, and that the amenities of international intercourse will not be for her until she mends her ways.

Russia did not mend her ways ; but, nevertheless, such "amenities of international intercourse" as are provided by a great cash loan were placed at her disposal by members of the very community who had protested with so much force and sincerity against persecutions that remain unabated and unchecked to-day.

The *Annual Register* for 1891 (p. 309) refers to the first loan as follows :

In April the Ministry of Finance endeavoured to raise a 3 per cent. Conversion Loan, but the attempt failed, owing to the opposition of Messrs. Rothschild, who refused to have any further dealings with a State which had roused the indignation of the world by its barbarous treatment of their co-religionists. It was believed that the policy which M. Vischnegratsky, the Russian Minister of Finance, had induced his Imperial master to accept, was that Russia should silently continue her war preparations, obtaining the necessary funds by successive so-called conversion loans. This policy had now received a check, and the friends of peace rejoiced accordingly. But their triumph did not last long. In September M. Vischnegratsky resumed negotiations in Paris for a loan of 500,000,000

francs, and, although the whole of the amount was not subscribed, a sufficient sum was obtained for the more pressing needs of the Russian Treasury, and further supplies were procured by the issue of 50,000,000 roubles in paper money.

With a thorough knowledge of Russia and her Government, the conductors of *Darkest Russia* on December 18, 1891, wrote as follows:

Almost every police agent and other government official has his hand ever open to receive a bribe in hard cash, and in bureaucratic Russia so numerous are the means of annoyance in the power of the petty officials that many of the people's hard-earned roubles are thus wrung from them.

Nor is this corruption peculiar to the petty employés, for frequent public trials for bribery, embezzlement of public funds, and misappropriation of land show that a tendency to dishonesty permeates the whole official class. The greed and meanness of Russian officials may be imagined, when it is stated by those in a position to know, that of the money and grain devoted by the Government to the relief of the sufferers from famine but little is likely to reach those for whom it is intended. In a country where the whole bureaucracy is corrupt, it may well be asked, "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?"

One of the latest theories of modern science is that the structure of an organism is largely the result of the function it performs; and if the Russian Government takes persecution for one of its most cherished functions it will soon develop the structure most suited to its purpose.

Little by little the Russian official, hardly yet completely emerged from savagery, will revert to his primitive barbarism, and the survivors of famine and pestilence will find themselves subjects, not of a Russian but of a Tartar Government. There is little chance of happiness for the unfortunate Russian nation, and less chance of its progress, until it is blessed with a bene-

ficent government in place of the careless bureaucrats who rule but cannot govern, who fail to protect life and property, who expel peaceful citizens from their homes, and deprive them of the fruits of their labours.

The sole hope of Russia would seem to be that the Tsar may be brought to recognise the fact that the purpose of a true government is the welfare of the people, and that he will replace the crowd of hungry officials now fattening on his subjects by those who really have at heart the people's good. The Tsar is credited with a keen desire for peace. Let him give his people peace at home, and remove from Russia the reproach of being the plague-spot of Europe. Under such conditions, his subjects, Orthodox, Dissenters, Jews, living in harmony, in perfect loyalty, protected and not harassed by the law, may yet attain a happy and dignified national life, promoting the aggrandisement of the empire and the civilisation of the world of which it forms so large a part.

The conductors of *Darkest Russia* vindicated the campaign they were conducting in dignified language. They said that "Russia had truly reason to fear the power of publicity to injure her prestige, and to do more solid harm to her diplomatic position." The publication of a journal like *Darkest Russia*, specially intended to keep Russia's misdeeds prominently before the world, was not without effect.

It cannot be in vain [it said] that over 25,000 copies of this journal are sent to all courts, embassies and consulates, to the chief newspapers and clubs in Europe, India and the United States, and to all personages of influence and public position throughout the world. We are wielding the only weapon of defence that can be raised to protect the persecuted millions of Israelites in Russia when we are calling to their aid the power of publicity.

In August 1893 *Darkest Russia* returned to the charge. The Tsar's Government wanted more money. Public opinion was appealed to as follows :

WHILE THE RUSSIAN RACE IS DEGENERATING THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT IS BORROWING MONEY FOR ARMAMENTS.

But equally indispensable is the new foreign loan, and necessity, which is so often found to be the Mother of Invention, is likewise very often the source of conviction.

To sober-minded men these precipitous movements backwards and forwards, these sweeping accusations and servile eulogiums, appear in their true light as desperate attempts to raise money with the goading knowledge that the problem is growing more and more arduous. And the money is wanted to obtain the means to break the peace of Europe. "If Russia can find the money," says the official *Moskovskia Vedomosti*—"and find it she will whenever it is needed—*what will the present increase of the German army signify in comparison with Russia's forces?*" And now, apparently, the time has come when it is needed, for new regiments are being organised, and a Mediterranean squadron of the Russian fleet is, we are told, about to be formed; several new line-of-battle ships and belted cruisers are being laid down to supply the place of those taken from the Black Sea. Such are the cares of the Government whose people are miserably perishing of hunger! "In Europe and in civilised countries of the whole world," exclaims one of the best journalists of St. Petersburg, "there is no people poorer or more illiterate than the Russian, no people housed in more primitive dwellings, no people who till the soil with more wretched agricultural implements. Even

heathen countries, like China and Japan, with their dense population able to read and write, and their superior agricultural methods, are far in advance of our Russian people. . . . Professor Janson, in his 'Comparative Statistics,' insists on the deplorable fact that '*the great Russian race is degenerating even as compared with the alien populations in its midst.* The one powerful and gifted stock of Slavonic colonisers which created one of the most mighty empires is now degenerating into *a diseased and feeble race which is losing even the capacity for progress.*' "*

## GENERAL VIEW OF THE CONDITION OF RUSSIAN SOLVENCY.

Summing up the facts, then, we find that Russian finances are based exclusively upon the solvency of the agricultural population of the country; that these unfortunate people are hopelessly insolvent, and are kept in a state of chronic starvation; that the corn indispensable to their existence is exported abroad; that they live for half the year in the open air, sleeping on the bare ground, and for the other half in hideous hovels; that they are obliged to sell their cattle, and to burn the straw of their roofs, in order to prolong this horrible life, and that they are physically degenerating and becoming unfit for manual labour; that the Government, instead of attempting to improve their miserable lot, blithely continues to augment its budget in inverse proportion to their insolvency, flogging them for arrears until they raise money at *6000 per cent. interest;* that even under the most favourable circumstances agriculture is absolutely unremunerative; that Russia does not produce a single grain of superfluous corn, and that mismanagement has brought about such an abnormal state of

* *Cf. Nedelya*, N. 43.

things in the Empire that a good harvest is more ruinous than a failure of the crops. Lastly, that they who lend Russia money, in the teeth of these indubitable facts, are not only making a financially unsound investment, but are rendering themselves morally responsible for the untold misery of a hundred millions of their fellow men.

# XIII

# THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS

# THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS

IMPLANTED more deeply in human nature than any passion—other than the perpetuation of one's own species—is the desire to propagate one's own opinion, and to show one's political and religious opponents that they are in the wrong. With Hooliganism and heathenism rampant in the great towns, with thousands of Christian children annually relapsing into illiteracy, the conversion of the Jews to Christianity by Anglo-Saxons is a process no less costly than inexplicable and hopeless—none the less because it is the conventional form of anti-Semitism adopted by Christendom.

There are at least a dozen recognised societies in Great Britain seeking the conversion of the Jews, besides a large number both on the Continent and in America. Figures are given freely, although a change of heart scarcely seems to lend itself to accurate statistical treatment. The number of proselytes in all the churches from Judaism was estimated by the late Dr. Delitzsch to be over 100,000. Sanguine believers in missions suppose it to be more now. The *Church Times*, so far back as August 17, 1883, says: "There is reason to believe that there is no family of the human

race which, on the whole, and in proportion to its size, yields more converts to Christianity." Also in "The Church and the Jew" by Rev. R. W. Harden, p. 22, we read:

> It is the testimony of one entitled to speak with authority, when missionary statistics are in question, that the converts from Judaism to Christianity in the present age are more numerous in proportion to population than those from among the heathen. And this is fully endorsed by the well-known fact—one which we have no reason to question—that in the present century no fewer than 100,000 Jews have embraced Christianity; and also that the number of conversions from Judaism to Christianity going on at present may be fairly estimated at 1000 a year at least.

It is surprising that the claim for so many converts should never have been challenged by Christians of accurate tastes, when the difficulties and hindrances experienced by a Jew when he embraces Christianity are taken into consideration. He loses caste, often loses the means of earning a living, and breaks with his nearest and dearest relations.

It is probable that few Christians have ever investigated the statistics of conversion claimed by the various missionary societies, while members of the Hebrew faith regard with too much contempt the business of proselytism conducted on the system adopted by the existing Christian societies. Serious Jewish thinkers and statesmen have learned to distrust all Christians having the least connection, pecuniary or otherwise, with the societies established for their conversion. In a note to this chapter I give two instances which have

occurred during recent years of a gigantic and fraudulent fabric of misrepresentation and dishonesty, which have been exposed in one case by the honourable action of the editor of the *Christian*, and in the other by the resolute determination of Dr. Christian Ginsburg, the distinguished Hebraist and scholar. I have endeavoured to arrive at an impartial and just conclusion on all the evidence for and against the Christian Missions for the conversion of the Jews which has passed through my hands. The result is not favourable to the societies. Their publications give hints which, followed up, show that payment and other advantages accrue to inquirers, and that prospective converts soon discover intimate association between their soul's health and their bodily comfort.

The Mildmay Mission, the Barbican Mission, and nearly a score of others are conduits for many payments to inquirers. The periodicals, like the Jewish *Intelligencer*, indicate the close connection between the hunger of proselyte souls and the nourishment of converts' bodies.

Other potent engines for the manufacture of Jewish proselytes are discovered in the Homes for Inquirers, "the Medical Missions," and other undertakings which enable convertible Hebrews to make the best of both worlds.

Conversion is not seldom followed by relapse, and reconversion becomes at once a spiritual and profitable necessity. One man named Arnstein, after exhausting Christian resources of charity, reverted to Judaism and attempted to trade upon his pretended return to the People of the Dispersion and to gain a living denied to

him in the Christian camp. His ardour was damped by the frank refusal of one of the most charitable and clear-sighted of his co-religionists to allow him to soil the faith he disgraced by drawing dishonest alms. He returned, accordingly, to Christianity and once more belongs to the faith he had previously renounced.

If orthodox Israelites are hostile to false converts, who are the trenchermen of a propaganda conducted by the paid agents of credulous Christians, they are also somewhat shy of missionaries to Jews. It is found that the paid agents of the missionary societies make much capital and advertisement at the May Meetings and on the platform of local societies all the year round owing to the prejudice and hostility of the Jews against them. The result is, so far as I am able to get at the facts, that the claim for converts, which formerly used to be made annually in the public reports, but which is now for the most part suppressed in print, is enormously exaggerated; that it is a question as to whether the Jews claimed as converts are more than a decimal fraction of the people whose lives are really changed by the missionary influence brought to bear upon them. Well may a learned and saintly Hebrew gentleman writing to me on the subject say:

> It is a question for Christians how much longer will they be content to be swindled out of the enormous sums which are much needed for objects that ought to be much nearer and dearer to the heart of God-fearing men? The conversion of the South London roughs is one of these objects that occurs to me at the moment.

The Jewish population is computed to be about 10,000,000. It is contended by the supporters of Jewish Missions that the Jewish mission field—which is world-wide—has only a small number of labourers. The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, has an income of about £40,000 a year and 154 agents. "There are not in the whole earth more than about 250 missionaries to the Jews, yet the living converts to Christianity are about 100,000."*

To gain an insight into the results of missions to the Jews from the point of view of the societies, an examination of the operations of one or two amongst the various agencies for mission work for the Jews, with facts and figures, will be of value. The contrast between the Jewish and the Christian point of view will thus be defined.

Leaving aside schools, homes, hospitals, &c., for the help of Jews, there are four chief societies in England for preaching the Gospel to the Chosen People. These are, first, the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews, founded in 1842. Twenty-four missionaries and many unpaid assistants are employed in visiting and instructing Jews and in distributing among them the sacred Scriptures and tracts. Second, the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews (1809) maintains 21 ordained missionaries, 25 unordained missionary agents, 86 colporteurs, scripture-readers, &c. (77 of whom are Christian Israelites), distributed among 41 stations in

* "Reasoning with the Jews," by Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds. P. 22.

Europe, Asia, and Africa. Income for year ending March 1895 was £35,492; expenditure £38,561. Third, the Mildmay Mission to the Jews (1876) embraces a variety of charitable agencies for the benefit of Jews. Fourth, the Parochial and Foreign Missions to the Jews' Fund (1876) promotes mission work among the Jews by providing in those parts where Jews more especially find their habitation, incumbents and additional curates specially trained for the work.

The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews is the *alma mater* of other societies. It was founded in 1809, and, as its name implies, for the Jews of London. But it soon extended its scope of work, and now has missions in Europe, Asia, Africa, and wherever the people of Israel are to be found. Of late years stations have been established at Leeds, Dublin, Hebron, Cork, Toronto, and in many Roman and Greek Catholic and Mohammedan lands. The following figures show the growth of the income of the society during a period of eighty years:

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1895 . . . . . | 39,393 | 6 | 9 |
| 1855 . . . . . | 28,780 | 13 | 3 |
| 1815 . . . . . | 8,791 | 17 | 8 |

Nearly 250,000 copies of the New Testament, more than 600,000 copies of the Old Testament, and nearly 5,000,000 missionary publications have been placed in the hands of Jews.

This organisation believes in the "Forward Movement," and lately has modified its home missions in order to break up new ground and to develop its work in the East.

According to the Rev. J. M. Eppstein :

There are over 250 converted Jews, or sons of such, ordained clergymen in the Church of England, and more than double that number in the Nonconformist bodies at home, in the Continental Churches, and in America.

It is asserted, and, I believe with truth, that as each Lord's Day comes round, the Gospel is proclaimed in more than 600 pulpits of Europe by Jewish lips. Over 350 of the recognised ministers of Christ in Great Britain are stated to be Hebrew Christians. Can such a record be shown in the returns of missions to the heathen? Doubtless there are in heathen lands, native heathen, many of them, ordained to the ministry of the Gospel. But where, in Western Europe, is the Church of Christ reaping from its labour in heathen lands the rich reward resulting from her poor, despised, much-derided mission to the Jew.*

In reply to the assertion that few English Jews embrace Christianity, one prominent Christian missionary writes as follows :

I have instructed and baptized twenty English Jewish families, composed of ninety-three souls, and twenty-nine other members of the English community. How many more may have been baptized from the commencement of the Society's labours, in London and the country, cannot easily be ascertained. The number, however, must be considerable. Many of the clergymen of Jewish origin are English-born Jews, and have received an English University education.

Baptized Jews [writes another missionary] are so numerous in Vienna that they are found in all ranks of society, from the Minister of State, the merchant prince, the ennobled banker

* "The Church and the Jew," by Rev. R. W. Harden. 1896. P. 3.

and influential senator, down to the commercial clerk, shopman and pedlar.

The following table shows in the first column the number of Jews in the nine original provinces of Prussia who have joined the State Church, and in the second column the number of Christians who have embraced Judaism in recent years:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In 1875 | 54 | 19 |
| 1876 | 50 | 10 |
| 1877 | 57 | 7 |
| 1878 | 74 | 5 |
| 1879 | 76 | 7 |
| 1880 | 120 | 16 |
| 1881 | 122 | 5 |
| 1882 | 136 | 16 |
| 1883 | 157 | 10 |
| 1884 | 134 | 11 |
| 1885 | 163 | 3 |
| 1886 | 170 | 10 |
| 1887 | 240 | 9 |
| 1888 | 348 | 7 |
| Total | 1901 | 135 |

Thus over 1900 Jews became Christians from 1875–1888, while 135 adherents of the Protestant State Church went over to Judaism. It is gratifying to propagandists to find the number of conversions increasing sixfold in fourteen years, while the opposite shows a steady decrease. But the Jews do not seek or welcome converts. One of the complaints, however, of the German anti-Semites is that "the fruits of Christian labour are harvested by the Jews; capital is concentrated in Jewish hands." The *New York Tribune* of February 1880, in an article entitled "The Anti-

Jewish Movement in Germany," said, "The rapid rise of the Jewish nation to leadership is the great problem of the future for East Germany."

Can the Church produce from among her heathen converts any whose work, in extent, magnitude, and permanence, will match with that of only a few of her distinguished Jewish proselytes? Whom will you set in Bible work against the Jew Schereschowsky, the translator of the Chinese Bible? Who for missionary labours to be compared to such Hebrews as Wolff or Stern? Or, for the wealth of the study, with Hebrew proselytes like Neander, or Christlieb, or Cassel, or Edersheim, or Saphir? *

The comparison of Jews with heathen is in accordance with the Collect for Good Friday in the Anglican Liturgy, but not with the canons of good breeding, seeing how much Jewish hospitality is dispensed to Christians.

The "Jewish Year-book" (1897) gives a list of Jewish celebrities of the nineteenth century, which is, however, not exhaustive. It is of Christian interest as the names of "Converted Jews" are included; amongst them we find the well-known names of Sir Julius Benedict, Sarah Bernhardt, Sir M. Costa, Da Costa, Isaac and Benjamin Disraeli, the Halevys, the Heines, the Herschells, the Mendelsohns, Moses Margoliouth, Dr. Neander, Sir F. C. Palgrave, A. G. Rubenstein, Sir Moses Salvador, Vambery; besides the missionaries Dr. Biesenthal, Dr. Paulus Cassel, Dr. Joseph Wolff. In addition to these are the names of Jules Simon, Señor Castelar, Père Hyacinthe, Dr. Capadose, Prof.

* "The Church and the Jew," by Rev. R. W. Harden. Paper 1. P. 3.

Christlieb, Dr. Howard Crosby (of New York), Dr. Edersheim, Samuda and Mocatta, and Bishops Alexander and Schereschowsky, Dr. Saphir, Dr. Stern, Rabbi Schwartzenburg, Professors Benfey, Heydemann and Stahl.

It is not very long ago that the Jewish press emphatically and persistently denied even the possibility of Jewish conversions. But it is different now. Herr Emil Lehman, one of the foremost representatives of advanced Judaism in Germany, mourning over the numerous defections from the ranks of the Synagogue, says : "It cannot be denied that *Jewish baptisms are of very frequent occurrence in these days among our co-religionists*, who are pre-eminent for mental culture, affluence, and propriety of conduct."

On the whole, therefore, the societies may be held to promote a knowledge of Christianity among the Jews, and it is a fact, while—thanks to the activities of anti-Semites—many Christians are better acquainted with certain extracts from the Talmud than they are with the Gospels, the majority of Jews are more familiar with the doctrines and sayings of the New Testament than they are with the Talmud and the Pentateuch.

Conversions of Jews took place in the early ages. St. Jerome says that the Church of the Jewish Christians "continued and was numerous in his own time." St. Jerome died about 420. He says particularly, that they rejected the traditions of the Rabbis, and believed in the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. (See St. Jer. Epist. 80 ad August.) We read of the conversion of the Jews in Candia in the fifth century (Basnage,

Book VI. XV. 4); in the sixth, of the Jewish inhabitants of Borium, in Africa (Basnage, VI. XXI. 4); in the seventh, of the Jews in Cyprus and other places; in the ninth century, of some in France; in the eleventh, in Germany; in the twelfth, in Germany, Spain, Normandy, and England. In the reign of Henry III. the names of 500 Jewish "converts" are recorded. Two of the most learned men of the fourteenth century were converted Jews: Paul of Burgos and Nicholas de Lyra, the latter really being the great precursor of the Reformation, for from him both Wycliffe and Luther learned the true mode of interpreting the Bible. In Queen Anne's reign also an Act of Parliament was passed for the purpose of enabling young Hebrew Christians to claim a maintenance from their parents, and the mere passing of such an Act proves that conversions from Judaism to Christianity were far from rare in those days.

The contrast between the spirit of Christianity and the spirit of Judaism in respect of missionary effort may be illustrated by two quotations:

*New Testament.*—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

*Talmud.*—"The Gentile who occupies himself with the Law is guilty of death. For it is said (Deut. xxxiii. 4), 'that Moses commanded us a law *even* the inheritance.' For *us* an inheritance, and not for them" (Talm. Bab. Sanhedrin, 59a). *Cf.* I. Thessalonians ii. 16, "Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved." But the charity of the Jews, especially among their own people, is well known, and it is not

surprising to find a long list of benevolent institutions which are supported by them. The total expenditure of those in the metropolis alone amounted last year to no less than £86,688, which, if the number of Jews in London be reckoned as 70,000, shows an average contribution of about 25*s*. per head by every member of the community, rich or poor. In a list of Jewish celebrities who have lived in various lands during the present century, and who have occupied a foremost place among their fellow-men, it is not a little remarkable that no fewer than 58, or 14 per cent. of the whole number, are marked as having been "converted," that is had embraced the Christian faith. It is often objected that mission work among Jews deals only with the lowest and least religious and intelligent class, and that converts are bought and do not become such from conviction. Still the fact remains that a surprisingly large proportion of the noblest intellects of the Jewish race have found satisfaction for their spiritual longings in the Christian faith.

On the other hand a missionary of the London Society writes about his work in East London :

> As a rule, the less educated Jews of to-day, as in the early days of Christianity, hear the truth more gladly than the better classes. Dealing with the latter is very hard. . . . I meet with much kindness in the homes of the more well-to-do Jews, but also with a deep-seated self-righteousness.

And another writes from Jerusalem :

> Another class, too, have come—American English-speaking Jews—but the few to whom I have spoken seem almost infidels. One day I offered a book to a working man, and

never, since I have worked among the Jews, have I heard such blasphemous language as he used, after tearing up the book, the Epistle to the Hebrews, in my face. Among both these, the well-to-do and the American Jews, it is difficult to find an entrance; but on the other hand I have had a warm welcome from my old friends, the poor, among the German-speaking Jews. . . . The Russian Jews especially are open to conversation, and are less prejudiced than the Jerusalem Jews.

In reference to our own time there are doubtless difficulties and mistakes in this important branch of mission work. There are many and increasing small societies and independent efforts, and from these rivalries and jealousies spring. But Mr. A. Lukyn Williams, M.A., says in his book "Missions to the Jews":

It is doubtless some realisation of the worst side of all religious effort that gives to objections to Jewish missions their piquant force. Yet, quite apart from converts . . . we cannot affect to pretend that missions have been a failure. . . . By their very existence they have quickened the Church and have brought to the Jew fresh interest in Christianity. . . . The individual Jew . . . has learned much more of the spiritual nature . . . of Christianity.

A few facts of the London Society's work at the different centres will be helpful as showing the results attained.

In the home field there are nine stations. In London the parishes of Spitalfields and Whitechapel form the Jewish quarter. The Jews are chiefly Polish. Their numbers (at present about 80,000) are continually increased by fresh arrivals from Eastern Europe. "The evils we have to face are ignorance and indiffer-

ence, entrenched behind superstition, and with a background of ineradicable hatred against Christianity." * During the years 1809–1895 there were 1842 Jewish baptisms. In Liverpool important work is carried on amongst the Jews at the Emigrants' Lodgings. At Bristol, Birmingham, and Hull the Jewish populations are visited and addresses given. The society has stations at Dublin and Cork.

In the European field there are thirteen stations and forty-four missionary agents. In Austria the Gospel has reached a good many Jews, though a missionary is greatly needed for Vienna. In France the work is carried on in a mission hall, and visits are made to Rouen, Havre, and other towns for work amongst resident and emigrant Jews.

The stations in Germany are now but few. In 1850 Frederick William IV. removed all the civil disabilities of the Jews; but the spread of anti-Semitism in recent years shows that the spirit of Jew hatred is not yet a thing of the past. The Rev. Dr. Cassel baptized 133 Jews and Jewesses during the last five years of his ministry (1886–1890). The number of Jews in Berlin is very large, and many of them occupy influential positions as merchants, financiers, professional men, and politicians. The mission work among them is of peculiar difficulty. The Rev. Professor Cassel, the society's missionary, finds the majority of his Jewish brethren ignorant of their own religion, careless and unbelieving. The condition of the Jews in Germany, and the feeling in regard to them, is still unsatisfactory. In a letter addressed last year to the visitors sent by

* Annual Report. 1896. P. 18.

the Committee to Berlin, Dr. Cassel refers to the great changes which have occurred in Germany during the last fifty years. Society and culture, he remarked, have assumed quite a different aspect. The Jews have changed. They are no longer in the Ghetto; their Oriental dress has been laid aside. The Talmud is no longer their only study. They are everywhere and take part in everything. They are not merely rich, but they are educated. The Talmud has, in many instances, become to them an unknown book; but they take an interest in the culture of the nineteenth century. He thinks that the anti-Semitic movement in Germany has inflicted a wound upon the foreign missions of the Evangelical Church of that country, as well as upon its missions to the Jews, because the interests of the one are so closely connected with those of the other.

Anti-Semitism [he says] resembles the spirit of Haman. It exhibits hate, whilst the missionary spirit manifests love. . . . I have baptized sixty Jews. Only one has fallen away, although some others have caused me much anxiety. Among them are doctors, authors, merchants, nearly all educated men. . . . But the success of mission work cannot be measured by statistics, although statistics have some meaning. . . .

Taken as a nation the Jews resist Christianity.

The Jews are a peculiar people; but in nothing is their peculiarity more strikingly exhibited than in the successful resistance which, as a nation, they have hitherto offered to the aggressive influence of Christianity and their absorption by the Church. No attentive student of history can fail to be arrested by the strange phenomenon presented by that people in the

face of the triumphant and all subduing progress of the Gospel. I say, as a nation, advisedly; for there has scarcely ever been a time when Judaism and the Jews have not been more or less affected by Christianity and Christian history. . . . But the fact remains, that the Jews, though forming originally the exclusive field of labour occupied by our Lord Himself and His Apostles, and though residing in the midst of Christendom, are the only nation who have not been absorbed by it. . . .*

Although the Jews in England probably do not exceed 100,000, the deference paid to them by her Majesty's Government is indicated by the action taken by the Home Secretary in the Office of Works with reference to the erection of Jewish synagogues in prisons. In Wormwood Scrubs and in two other prisons synagogues have been recently erected on the specific ground that the number of Jewish prisoners was sufficient to justify the expenditure. The Home Secretary found himself unable to reply to a question put by Mr. Pickersgill, member of Parliament for Bethnal Green, as to whether the number of Jews in the population had largely increased in recent years. The numbers of the Protestant and Roman Catholic prisoners, respectively, are well known, and the mystery that surrounds the Jewish prisoners is merely one more tribute to the growing influence of this body in our midst.

Funds which are collected all over England from good but silly people who are really deluded into the idea that they are promoting the salvation of souls are really wasted. I know of nothing in our generation

* "The Influence of Christianity and Christian History upon Judaism and the Jews," Rev. M. Wolkenberg, Society's House, 1875.

which is such a deplorable waste of money and energy and such a huge delusion. Many persons concerned pursue the work from the purest intentions. There is something quite pathetic in reading the various literature on the subject. It is appalling to observe the utter lack of knowledge of present day Jews and of the Jewish faith which is displayed by those who fancy they can make them Christians. There is an impression that Hebrew is their vernacular and that they could not read the New Testament in English, so they go to the expense of translating the New Testament into Hebrew. It would be grotesque, if it were not melancholy, to see vast sums of money, urgently needed for the general poor and hospitals, squandered on the manufacture of hypocrisy. The money is obviously spent in elaborate organisation in various forms among the least worthy sections of the community. Every sensible Christian ridicules in his heart this preposterous and impudent interference with the Jewish religion, and it is surprising that no one of them has yet denounced it publicly.

While English Christians spend £130,000 on the conversion of the Jews, they do not spend one penny on the conversion of Unitarians, whose theological views are substantially the same.

## Note A.—HERMANN WARSZAWIAK.

The most notorious recent case of swindling on a large scale by a Hebrew Christian missionary is that exposed a few months ago. The scamp, named Warszawiak, succeeded in obtaining nearly £6000 from one lady in 1894. As is usual in these

cases his cause was championed by ardent but careless controversialists long after the proof of his scoundrelism was apparent to laymen. Mr. Varley, the well-known evangelist, sturdily championed the false missionary's cause in America. When he became convinced that he was the victim of a flagrant deception he admitted his error in the following manly and straightforward letter to Dr. Schauffler, who was one of the first to expose the rascal:

"I was influenced by the wily glosses with which I now see Warszawiak invested his statements, especially those that had reference to yourself. I never heard of any one who can more cleverly distort and misrepresent statements and persons. Seeing that the Presbytery will deal with his appeal, I need not further allude to that phase of this painful case.

"I cannot, however, remain silent after the intelligence just received from England. The case of the lady from whom H. Warszawiak succeeded in obtaining nearly $30,000 (£6000) in 1894, and which is likely to be the subject of judicial investigation, leaves no room to doubt that Warszawiak cannot be regarded as worthy of confidence. Believing the statements made to me in October last by H. W, that both he and his wife had been unjustly treated, and that the Jewish mission work in his hands had been grossly misrepresented, I wrote strongly in his defence. It was not for his character only, but much more for the work in his care among the Jews in New York that I did so.

"I have now to confess that I was deceived, and led to write that which reflected unjustly upon yourself, Mr. Jesup, and Mr. Anthony Comstock. I, therefore, withdraw that which was written, and express my deep regret, my sincere apologies, that I was induced to defend one whose conduct I now see has merited severe censure. Interested in our Jewish brethren in New York, I fear this unhappy case will set back the work there seriously. It is some cause for thankfulness

that the Lord has overruled my mistake, and that the conclusive facts which have come to light will aid in showing that Hermann Warszawiak is unworthy the confidence of Christians interested in Jewish missions in New York and elsewhere."

In addition to other defalcations the sum of £4200 was sent to Warszawiak in two drafts of £2100 each. The drafts still exist bearing Warszawiak's signature, also his receipt for the money, proving that the cash passed into his hands. It never seems to have passed out of them. As a gambler he obtained some notoriety.

Under these circumstances the *Christian* of February 3, 1898, very prudently cautioned friends against supplying this interesting propagandist with any further funds. Generous Christians had, however, unfortunately responded largely to his plausible importunities.

## NOTE B.—REV. J. E. SALKINSON.

The Rev. J. E. Salkinson, who was engaged in missionary work for the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews, was commissioned to make a Hebrew version of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," which he did, and it was published in 1858. At the request of Dr. Ginsburg he translated Milton's "Paradise Lost" into Hebrew, as well as various other pieces which were widely circulated by almost all the Jewish missionary societies. But he was accused of falsifying some parts of his Hebrew translation of Milton's "Paradise Lost," of being unfit to translate the New Testament into Hebrew, and of making false reports to the committee about his missionary work. These grave accusations were brought against him by an individual called Dr. Joseffy, who was engaged as a Jewish missionary in connection with the English Presbyterian Church. This Jew was really an impostor, but said he was Rabbi of Vienna, and had given up everything

for Christ's sake on his conversion. A remarkable account of Dr. Joseffy's life and conversion was given in *The Messenger and Missionary Record of the Presbyterian Church of England*, November 1, 1878. He was highly spoken of in this report, and the Rabbi, Dr. Joseffy, was stated now to be a Christian missionary, preaching the faith he formerly denied. He was said to have suffered many things on his conversion. After his baptism in Stuttgart he preached to his brethren for the society. In the *Weekly Review*, April 26, 1879, notice is given that the committee had resolved that Dr. Joseffy was qualified by Christian character and ability to carry the Gospel of Christ to God's ancient people. On January 19, 1879, the Rev. J. Salkinson received, to his surprise, a letter from Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, from which he learned of the accusations against him about the translations, which emanated, as Dr. Ginsburg told him, from that Dr. Joseffy who was engaged by the English Presbyterian Society, and as Joseffy had represented himself as being Rabbi of Vienna, and having made enormous sacrifices both of wealth and office for Christ's sake, his statements were believed. Dr. Ginsburg went to see Joseffy, and though they argued together, the latter could not be shaken.

However, in April Mr. Salkinson made inquiries, and when Dr. Ginsburg came to Vienna communicated to him the things he had heard of Dr. Joseffy. When these inquiries were made, the people who were thoroughly acquainted with his antecedents and manner of life, were honourable members of the Jewish community, and did not know that he had embraced Christianity. They, one and all, described him as a vagabond and an abandoned character, always changing the aspect of his faith according to circumstances.

In May, Mr. Palotta, a Christian Israelite, had seen in the *Weekly Review* a marvellous account of this Dr. Joseffy, who had been appointed missionary to the Jews in Vienna, and, in conjunction with another minister in the city, determined to

write to Dr. Graham, Moderator of the English Presbyterian Church, on the subject, as, knowing Joseffy's antecedents, he was convinced that if such a man came as a missionary to Vienna, where his character was known, it would damage evangelical work in that important town. It was learnt through Mr. Palotta that Joseffy was no doctor, he was never Rabbi of Vienna, and instead of having been deprived of his property by his wife for becoming a Christian, as was stated, he had deserted her and was living with another woman.

Unwilling to admit themselves in the wrong now that the true facts were known, some members of the committee endeavoured to make out that Dr. Ginsburg and Mr. Salkinson had made the minister and Mr. Palotta write these letters against Joseffy. Dr. Ginsburg, on his return to England, informed the society that the accounts which Dr. Joseffy gave of himself were false from beginning to end. Although the proofs were incontrovertible, as Dr. Ginsburg said on writing to Salkinson, "The two Scotch members of the committee, as well as the secretary, have Joseffy on the brain, and are prepared to sacrifice any one who utters a word against him."

On May 20, 1879, Dr. Ginsburg received notice from the Committee of the Jewish Mission of the Presbyterian Church of England that he should give an unconditional withdrawal of his charges against Joseffy. Meanwhile, inquiries had been instituted, and on June 27, 1879, Dr. Kaufmann, Professor of the Rabbinic College at Pesth, wrote that he had searched in every nook and every recess for an advocate for Joseffy, "but found none to speak a word in favour of that man." From reliable sources it was found that Joseffy practised bigamy, and no place could bear him long. Also Dr. Braun, of Vienna, wrote on July 13, 1879, that at Neusatz, in Hungary, Joseffy had been imprisoned for an offence. His wife was separated from him (1860–64) because he was leading an abandoned life, and the letter ends with "I only regret that it

is impossible for me to point out one shining feature in the life of Mr. Joseffy."

On July 16 it was agreed that no reference should henceforth be made to Dr. Joseffy's past life, and the charges were withdrawn. But more trouble arose, as the statements were only withdrawn, not recanted, as was given out in the *Jewish Herald*, August 1, 1879, p. 96. The document containing the withdrawal of the charges was simply laid before the committee, and no comment was made on it, which was nothing more nor less than misrepresenting the whole case, for no reference was made to Dr. Joseffy's abject confession of his wrong and false accusations against Mr. Salkinson, his apology to Dr. Ginsburg, and this silence about everything that would go against Joseffy can only be characterised as despicable conduct.

On October 3, 1879, letters from such sources as Dr. Luzzatto, of Padua, Dr. Frankl, Secretary of the Jewish Council of Public Worship, Dr. Goldschmid, Rabbi of Leipzig, Rev. R. Koenig, Minister of the Presbyterian Free Church and Missionary to the Jews at Pesth, prove beyond a doubt that Joseffy was a scoundrel of the deepest dye. He never was Rabbi of Vienna, he never possessed wealth, fame, or power, never left behind him any good reputation anywhere, was divorced from his wife in 1864, married a second time in 1865, was again divorced in 1867, and married a third wife. The proofs are all in the register at Pesth.

Thus the exposure of the imposture of a brother Jew, who was defended in the face of all proof by the society, caused the resignation of Mr. Salkinson, as the society preferred to believe the word of Joseffy, and refused to admit themselves in the wrong.

# XIV

# JEWISH HUMOUR

# JEWISH HUMOUR

CARLYLE'S aversion to the Jews was Teutonic in its intensity, and his opinion, therefore, on any subject connected with the Chosen People was marked by a bias fatal to sound judgment. He declared that the Jews had no humour, and showed no trace of it at any period of their history. This, says Mr. Froude, was "a fatal defect in Carlyle's eyes, who regarded no man or people as good for anything who were without a genial sympathy with the under side." Renan says very much the same thing in his great work on the "History of the Semitic Languages." At a lecture delivered at the London Institution, January 5, 1893, Dr. Adler, the Chief Rabbi, set himself to deny the assertion that the Jew has little perception of the ludicrous, and quotes Isaiah's description of the manufacture of an idol as an example of "genuine humour." Dr. Adler's able and scholarly article is in itself a demonstration of the lack of humour in one of the foremost and most respected of modern Jews. Heine and Zangwill have done something to redeem the race from the charge brought against them, but the former was a convert to Christianity, while the latter, gifted with a faculty of subtle and somewhat sardonic humour,

never bubbles over with fun. Mr. Zangwill's humour increases the impression of the strenuousness and intense purpose of the race. The claim of the modern Jew to a sense of humour rests almost entirely on Heine's reputation, but his line of activity was that of a soldier in the war of liberation of humanity, and his wit was mordant rather than genial. Merciless in attack, Heine's genius is marked by sarcasm rather than by humour, while the last eight years of his life were passed on a couch where he lay helpless, the use of his limbs gone, and suffering at short intervals paroxysms of nervous agony, it is scarcely surprising that his laughter was hardly ever without the note of tragedy. Matthew Arnold accords to Heine that which Carlyle and Renan deny to the race, but even the prodigality of Heine's wit is rarely expressed in any but the minor key.

Dr. Adler concluded his lecture with the three following anecdotes :

A dialogue overheard at the Stock Exchange on a frosty winter's morning :

"Mr. Moses, what would you advise me to buy to-day?"

"Thermometers, of course, they are very low at present, and are sure to rise."

A Mr. Goldsmith became a convert to Christianity. He thought it advisable to adopt a name with a more Gentile ring, and dubbed himself Mr. Smith.

"What a fool!" exclaimed a member of the congregation on hearing of the change; "this is the first Jew who has thrown away his gold."

At a festive banquet, representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergy had been invited, and were en-

gaged in pleasant converse. The Rabbi, faithful to the dietary precepts of his religion, partook of only a few of the dishes. An appetising joint of roast pork was set on the table. The Catholic priest turned to his neighbour, and asked, "When will the time come that I may have the privilege of serving you with a slice of this delicious meat?" "When I have the gratification of assisting at your reverence's wedding," the Rabbi rejoined, with a courteous bow. . . .

In the belief that the alleged deficiency of humour in the Jewish character was a charge repeated from mouth to mouth without due investigation, I have gone to some expense and trouble to ascertain the facts so far as the contents of the British Museum enabled me to do so. The following anecdotes from Jewish sources are all that I received in return for an expenditure of £30 on an investigation of thousands of Jewish newspapers and books and a heavy correspondence with everybody likely to help me in my search. It will be observed that nearly all the anecdotes in this chapter relate to money, a subject upon which the modern Jew still jokes with difficulty. I think it will be admitted on the facts that whatever may be thought of Isaiah and the ancients, the modern Jew is not a humourist.

*Jewish Society*, 1890.

Jews have of late years entertained royalty somewhat largely. I fancy the first Jew to entertain a member of the English royal family was the famous Abraham Goldsmid. He had a house at Morden, and it is related that one day King George III., during a drive with Queen Charlotte, alighted from his carriage for a stroll, and stopped to admire some fine trees enclosed within a gentleman's park. In answer to an inquiry his

Majesty was told that the estate belonged to Abraham Goldsmid the Jew.

"What, what! My Abraham?" exclaimed the King; "I must see to it. Go and tell Mr. Goldsmid to get some luncheon ready for us, and we shall go to him at once."

King George's commands were obeyed, and the vast resources of the household of the great loan contractor were called into requisition. A sumptuous repast was laid before their Majesties, who sat down, while Goldsmid and his family remained standing, like dutiful subjects.

"Come, Goldsmid," said the King, observing this, "if you don't sit down to luncheon I shall stand up too."

The King was not a Lucullus, but he loved good cheer, and he seldom enjoyed a repast more than the one in which, side by side with the financier, he tasted the delicacies of the season.

*Jewish Record, August* 17, 1871.

Here is an anecdote going the round of the German papers. Prince Bismarck, after a long conversation with the able and learned Jewish lawyer, Lasker, about different important subjects of the day, remarks:

"We must yet become close colleagues."

"Will your Excellency become a lawyer?" was the immediate rejoinder of Lasker. He meant to say that, as a Jew, he is excluded from every higher State office.

An American paper furnished a contrast to the foregoing, in the form of an anecdote related by King Louis Philippe to an old friend:

I intended to appoint, as peers, all the celebrities of different professions and creeds, and among them also a Jew. I thought of General Wolff, who distinguished himself in the war and was very popular in the army. I proposed him to the Ministers,

but was informed that General Wolff, at the time he used to play whist with the Duchess of Berry, turned I-Kian.

*Eh, bien!* I could not appoint General Wolff a peer, as he was no Jew.

*Jewish Society*, 1890.

Jakey: "Father, if I take a half-crown out of somebody's pocket, that's stealing it, ain't it?"

Mr. Isaacs: "Certainly."

Jakey: "And if I bet a half-crown and win his half-crown, that's gambling?"

Isaacs: "Of course."

Jakey: "And if I've got something worth only a half-crown and sell it to him for five shillings, what is that?"

Isaacs: "That? Oh, my boy, that's business, Jakey, simply business."

## CHARLES LAMB AND THE JEWS.

*Jewish Record, August* 18, 1871.

Charles Lamb described the Jew as a person who was once contemplated with much horror, but who in his day had nothing in him lovely.

We have tamed the claws of the beast, and pared its nails, and now we take it to our arms, fondle it, write plays to flatter it; it is visited by princes, affects a taste, patronises the arts, and is the only liberal and gentlemanlike thing in Christendom.

*Jewish Society*, 1890.

A good story has been going the rounds about Baron Rothschild of Paris, who, as is well known, possessed almost fabulous wealth. Having occasion to enter an omnibus, in a fit of abstraction he was about going away without paying. The driver stopped him and demanded his fare. Rothschild felt in

his pocket, but he had not a copper in change. The driver was very wroth.

"Well, what did you get in for if you could not pay? You must have known that you had no money."

"I am Baron Rothschild," exclaimed the great capitalist, "and here is my card."

The driver threw the card into the gutter.

"Never heard of you before," said the driver, "and I do not want to see you again. But I want my fare, and I must have it."

The great banker was in haste.

"I have only an order," he said; "give me change." And he proffered a coupon for ten thousand francs.

The conductor stared, and the passengers set up a hoarse laugh. Just then a friend passed by, and the Baron borrowed of him the necessary six sous, thus releasing himself from a most unpleasant predicament.

*Jewish Standard, January* 9, 1891.

A curious request was made to me the other day through the medium of a third party. A certain aged but ardent lover wished to be married. Unfortunately, as is often the case, he was too poor to marry. He could just defray the synagogue fees at one of the higher synagogues, but he had not enough money in the world to purchase a high hat. Would I lend him mine? Those learned in the subject informed me that a marriage without a high hat would not be a legal one. I had known that the Almighty did not listen to the Sabbath prayers of any worshipper who did not wear a high hat, but this was a new point. I had a vague sort of suspicion that somewhere in the remote past I had purchased or stolen a sober funnel of the necessary order, and my heart (despite the teachings of political economy) was moved to pity by the thought of the sorrows

of lovers kept apart by a high hat. After much ransacking of my memory and my wardrobe, I discovered a queer sort of rustic cylinder. Determined that the path of true love should run smooth, I brushed it till it became more respectable than I shall ever be myself, and sent it to the expectant bridegroom, together with a copy of the famous volume, "How to be Happy, Though Married."

And now I have a letter from him, full of gushing gratitude and incorrect spelling, telling how blissfully he is honeymooning in the South of London. It is perhaps the first time that Cupid, like a conjurer, has borrowed a high hat. And it is very certain that my pauper Benedick is the only man who will ever be married in my high hat.

# CONCLUSION

# CONCLUSION

ANATOLE LE ROY BEAULIEU states his opinion to be that the Jews will amalgamate with any nation which gives them a chance. The statement is surprising. No confirmation is given by history to the assertion, unless the absorption of the Lost Tribes be cited as a case where the aloofness of Israel has been overcome. On the contrary, the whole tendency of history is to prove that either the Jews are held down by a series of special regulations, as in England formerly, and in Russia to-day, or that they became predominant to an alarming extent, partly by their abilities and partly by the indifference of many of them to the ethical laws which govern the relations between man and man; laws which, in fact, in the shape of the Ten Commandments, form the unseen foundations of society. Since the numbers of the Jews are largely on the increase, and their wealth and power have enormously developed, the prospects for the future are not encouraging either for them or for Christendom. The comparatively small minority of Jews who are honestly absorbed in the various nationalities of their adoption are too few to do more than delay a crisis seemingly inevitable and now within the arena of practical politics. In the

twenty years that succeeded the expulsion of the Jews from England in 1292, every country, with the exception of Poland, followed British example. After the lapse of 600 years a new unrest is perceptible throughout the civilised world on the subject of the Jewish Question, while the problem in Russia is no longer soluble by mere administrative restrictions. The conclusion, therefore, seems obvious that either the situation must be dealt with—*i.e.*, by Europe as a whole—or an alarming outbreak against the race, the members of which are always in exile and strangers in the land of their adoption, will result, and the clock of civilisation will thus be thrown back for a hundred years. The Jewish Question, however difficult, is not insoluble. During the last century the Hebrew communities throughout Europe have had every opportunity for exhibiting their capacity for complete and honest absorption. They have neglected to use this opportunity with the exception of a few of the richer families, exempted from the necessity for toil, to whom it is unnecessary again to refer, and who, needless to say, are not touched by what I am about to state.

Since the Hebrew race, after a century of trial, under fairly good conditions, at all events for sixty or seventy years of the time, have persistently refused to unite with other nationalities, no other alternative is possible than to discover some territory which should be Oriental, at no great distance from Europe, and associated, if possible, directly or indirectly with Palestine. Such a territory exists in Armenia between the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates. It is the cradle of the race. The depopulation of Armenia by

Turkish massacres has made a considerable portion of the country available for resettlement. The over-crowding of the Russian Pale renders action by the Tsar inevitable at no very distant date. That action can only take one of two forms—massacre, or the provision of more territory for settlement. From careful inquiries I have made in Russia among all classes of society, it is unlikely that the Tsar's Ministers will permit the Jews to occupy a larger portion of the Russian Empire than that in which they already drag on the saddest existence. If, therefore, Russia transfers or migrates a portion of her Jewish political and financial population, necessities require that the site shall be in some land near by, controlled by the Tsar, inhabited by non-Slavs, and separated if possible from Russia proper by natural barriers. There is no territory that so completely answers these requirements as Turkish Armenia. The Armenians themselves are of Semitic origin. No injury will be inflicted upon them by contact with the Russian Jews. The nearness of Armenia avoids most of the insuperable obstacles presented by systematic immigration to the Argentine Republic, to South Africa, or elsewhere across the ocean. A mountain range divides Russia from Armenia. Russian Armenia, formerly Persian, forms the north-east part of old Armenia Major, and includes the governments of Erivan, Elizabetpol, and Kars, as also parts of the government of Tiflis. Persia holds the south-east corner of Armenia Major in the province of Azerbigan. The racial qualities of the Armenians are singularly akin to those of the Jew. In their essential national cohesion and persistency of

national type they resemble the Israelite. Like the Jew the Armenians are dispersed all over the world, and their quick adaptive intelligence and arrested ethical development specially qualify them for success in trade. As money changers, merchants, and bankers, the Armenians hold their own with the Jews. Their number in Armenia itself in 1888 was estimated at 1,000,000 at the utmost, and recent raids of nomadic Kurds, massacres of official Turks, and consequent emigration have probably reduced that number by 250,000. The break up of the Turkish Empire will give Russia a free hand in Turkish Armenia, and the significant concentration of Russian troops on the frontier suggests the possibility of effective occupation whenever a suitable opportunity arises.

That the idea of transferring to Armenia a portion of the Russian Jews of the Pale has already occurred to Russian Ministers I can personally testify. When I was engaged in negotiations on behalf of Baron de Hirsch for the relief of the Russian Jews, the late M. De Giers, then Foreign Minister (himself believed to be of Jewish origin), on several occasions sent for me to the Foreign Office at a late hour of the night in order to discuss the possibilities of the Jewish Question. Although the matter was not officially in his Excellency's department, his extreme concern for harassed Israel made a powerful impression on me. On one occasion the good old man was melted to tears at the description of some Jewish children in the hospital at Homel, deprived of proper food and medicine by the exactions of the Imperial Russian police. M. de Giers agreed with me that more territory for settlement was

essential if the lives of the Jewish subjects of the Tsar were to be saved; and while he predicted failure for the Argentine project of Baron de Hirsch, his Excellency on more than one occasion referred in a mysterious way to the possible provision of land elsewhere for the overcrowded Jews of the Pale. I did not at the time attach great importance to the matter, but in subsequent conversations with two of the Imperial Ministers references pointedly made to Armenia and the Armenians in relation to the Jews suggested the probability of a possible destination for the superfluous Jewish population of Poland and the Pale being discovered in Armenia.

It is needless to point out that if anything of the kind should be done—and the revival of the Jewish Question in a new and intenser form is rendered inevitable by the natural increase of the people—the Jews planted in Armenia would find themselves in the Hinterland of Palestine. It would not be long before Jewish influence would make its way to the sea, and with a Jewish population already numbering some 40,000 in the Holy Land, the fulfilment of prophecy would come about by the operation of natural and economic law.*

* The United States Consul at Beirut describes, in a report which has lately been issued by the Department of State in Washington, the condition of the numerous Jewish colonies in Palestine. The population of the country is about 200,000, of which 40,000 are Jews, as compared with 14,000 twenty years ago. Jerusalem alone contains 22,000 Jews, half of whom have emigrated from Europe and America, and are called Aschkenazim, the Oriental Jews being known as the Sephardists. About 5000 Jews, in 960 families, inhabit 22 colonies in Palestine which have been founded by European associations. The "Jacob Memorial" is the largest of these colonies. It contains 1000 persons,

The chief hope for the solution of the Jewish Question lies in the recognition by Europe, and especially by Russia, that the only effective means by which the lot of Israel can be alleviated is by the provision of adequate territory in the near East for the sustenance of families for whom no provision is possible in their present localities. Still the Jewish Question in Europe and America is likely to grow more intractable before a Jewish State is founded in Armenia, or an asylum is provided by the chief Jew-baiting Power of Christendom. Signs are not wanting that the patience of

and has 4000 acres under cultivation, the rearing of silkworms being the chief industry. The "First to Zion" colony owns 2000 acres, and grows a vast quantity of grapes, olives, almonds, and other fruits. It also possesses famous wine cellars. The "Hope of Israel," in the plains of Sharon, has a large agricultural school, and the "Head Corner-stone," in the hills beyond Tiberias, at the foot of Hermon, is also very prosperous; for, being near the source of the Jordan, water is plentiful, and the situation above the Lake of Gennesareth is healthy. The Consul thinks that, whether the Zionist movement succeeds in its special aim or not, the agitation aids in the development of Palestine—a country "which will generously respond to modern influences." The Sultan is disposed to grant railway, harbour, and other concessions, and the projected Jewish Colonial Bank may be able to play an important part in the development of Palestine. The Zionist movement, also, is said to be bringing out new qualities in the Jews inhabiting the country; they are no longer content with studying the Talmud and living on charity, but are beginning to act on the principle that "to till the ground is to worship God." Peace and prosperity, however, are not yet wholly their lot. Quite lately a Jewish colony near El Mzerib, on the caravan route from Damascus to Mecca, was destroyed by predatory Beduins, the very road made by the colonists to connect their settlements with others in Galilee being partially obliterated. Taxes are more oppressive than ever; officials are corrupt, and prohibitive regulations against immigration are still in existence, though they have proved ineffective. But, on the whole, the Consul thinks "the prospects are brighter than ever for the Jews in Palestine and for Palestine itself. European influence has obtained a foothold in the country, and the tide of modern ideas cannot be long debarred."

Anglo-Saxons, after six decades of practical toleration and equality before the law, is beginning to give way. The Money-Lending Bill of Lord James of Hereford is purely anti-Semitic in its effects. The agitation against the Jewish house-farmers of the East End is unlikely to disappear until the wrongs complained of by the poorer class of tenants are redressed by the legislature. In the United States the situation is much the same as in Great Britain, where modern Imperialism has been largely availed of by Jewish capitalists of no great delicacy to promote schemes for filling their own pockets, which are neither imperial in character nor just to the community. From these evils it is difficult to perceive any issue, unless it be in the growing weight and importance of women's influence in political and social life. While experience and the teachings of history combine to deter the lawgiver from giving to women in the older countries of the world complete political equality with man, the alarming growth of Jewish materialism and cosmopolitan indifference to family and national development seems to call for redress from a source that is neither to be bought nor influenced. In the growth of the woman's movement I look for the healthiest antidote to Jewish materialism.

# APPENDIX

# APPENDIX

## PROPHECIES

In the course of investigation for the purpose of writing this book I quickly discovered that very large numbers of Christians consider that the unfulfilled prophecies respecting the Jews are about to be fulfilled. Having no acquaintance whatever with hermeneutics, I asked my father, the late Reverend Edward White, the author of "Life in Christ" and "Conditional Immortality," to give me a brief conspectus of the present state of scholarship on the subject. He said (Oct. 14, 1897):

"People who are fulfilling the ancient Jewish prophecies are seldom aware of the fact that they are so occupied, which makes the fulfilment all the more remarkable. The history of the civilised world since the rise of the Babylonian Empire (*i.e.*, B.C. 626) has been one long series of such 'fulfilments,' as anybody who will study Birks' 'Four Empires' will discover. (Birks was a Mill Hill boy, and afterwards Master, and then Senior Wrangler at Cambridge, and wrote the best and most learned extant books on the prophecies in English.)

"On these prophetic grounds of belief, I consider that we now have arrived at, or near, the end of the 'Seven Times of the Gentiles,' or 7 × 360—(2520 years) since the rise of the Babylonian Empire in B.C. 626, during all of which time it was foretold that the Jews should be subject to those Powers,

and mostly 'scattered.' But they are to be 'brought back' at the end, and settled in Palestine.

"I am not surprised, therefore, that on quite natural and national grounds, the question of Jewish settlement has come up now, and that the Sultan will act a friendly part to his fellow anti-Christian Monotheists. But then things will be brought about by people who have no faith in 'Hebrew Prophecies' (as it was in relation to the manifestation and history of Christ 1900 years ago).

"Only those who have followed carefully what has been called the whole 'Calendar of Prophecy' can appreciate the astonishing conformity of Asiatic, European, and Jewish history to those predictions during these 'Seven Times of the Gentiles.' The fulfilled prophecies of the appearance of Christ, when He arose in Palestine, were only one section of a wider series, which series has now to be treated in its entirety and in relation to European history and power—the world-wide overthrow of paganism and superstition and the reconstruction of Asia. The fortunes of the Jews are in the Bible mixed up with those of the whole quadruple series of Gentile predictions. So called 'Miracles' have ceased, but the miraculous evidence of prophecy has always been steadily on the advance.

"I don't know whether you have my book on the 'Mystery of Growth.' If you have, you will find a note on these subjects affixed to the end of a lecture on the 'Great Asiatic Revolution in the days of Nebuchadnezzar,' which was written just thirty years ago, but to which I adhere at the end of this long interval, and at the end of so much subsequent study.

"That which gives so marvellous an interest to this Jewish re-occupation of Palestine is, that one part of the prophecies concerned affirms the reappearance of Christ to the restored nation—'His feet shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives' (Zechariah xiv. 4), as if the Jewish nation is to be

converted to the faith (like St. Paul) by a visible reappearance of the Messiah, so long rejected.

"Now I have given you gratis a brief conspectus of my belief on these matters, to which I was driven from more popular views by a connected study of the books concerned, and a connected study of part fulfilments."

## THE SEVEN TIMES OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

"Seven times shall pass over him."—DANIEL II.

"Eighteen years ago (in the year 1848), I addressed a letter to the —— proposing some chronological questions bearing on the then prevalent and much-promulgated doctrine that the Popedom would come to an end in the present year 1866, or thereabouts. The general revival of this expectation under the sanction of some respectable names lends perhaps sufficient interest to the interpretation of the chronological prophecies to permit of the repetition of the conjectural statements offered in my former letter. As a partial excuse for this repetition, I may plead the request of some well-known scholars, who have thought the conjectures worthy of notice at the present time.

"All things considered, one naturally shrinks from the ill-repute attached to an appearance 'among the prophets'; but when I say that the object of this communication is not to offer any predictions, but only to direct attention to the fact that, assuming the validity of the general principles of the 'year-day' school of interpreters, those principles are susceptible of another, and, perhaps, better application than that which brings all things to a crisis in 1866, the utility of such conjectures will be admitted; especially by those who reflect that, should the next few years pass, as I apprehend that they will, without bringing us to the 'end,' there will still be no reason for a violent sceptical reaction against historical and

chronological prophecy, but much reason for still 'waiting' patiently the promised arrival of a better time.

"The general principles to which I have referred, and which, although open to much objection on the part of learned opponents, I shall assume for the present object to be defensible against all comers, are these. I. The reality of definite historical prophecy, in contradistinction to the scheme of Dr. Arnold, Professor Godwin, and Mr. Porter. II. The correctness of the 'year-day theory,' in virtue of which the 'seven times' that 'passed over' Nebuchadnezzar in his bestial transformation are regarded as typical of 'the times of the Gentiles,' and as designed to represent two periods of three times and a half each, or twice 1260 years (2520 years), of which the latter is identical with the 1260 days (so often spoken of in the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse) whose end is synchronous with the downfall of God's enemies on earth.

"I shall not trouble the reader with any detailed account of the more usual application of these two general principles. Let it suffice to say that from the days of Mede and Newton, down to those of Fleming, Faber, Elliot, Birks, Wylie, and Cumming, interpreters have been sorely put to it to discover a good beginning for the longer period of 2520 years, as well as for the second moiety of that period, the 1260 years whose termination is to see the end of the 'apostasy.' They have placed the beginning of the 'seven times' at different points in the history of the old Assyrian Empire, and the beginning of the latter 1260 years at the era of some obscure edict of the Emperor Phocas, in the year A.D. 606, with the result of bringing their 'calendar' to a conclusion in 1866 or 1867.

"My object is to show that, while retaining the fundamental idea that the 'seven times' of Nebuchadnezzar's bestial degradation are typical of 2520 years of the Gentile dominions, represented in vision under the emblem of four 'wild beasts,'

and that their termination will witness the end of the present 'age,' there may be conjectured a better beginning, a better middle, and a better end of this great secular period, than those which are now believed in by the generality of prophetical interpreters.

"The conjecture which I have to propose is this, that if the 'seven times' of Nebuchadnezzar's degradation symbolise the period during which the four great empires, resembling 'wild beasts,' should dominate over the world and oppress the Church of God, then it is probable that the commencement of those seven times is to be reckoned from the era of the rise of the first of the four empires, the Babylonian. In the measure in which it is probable that that era is the true starting-point of the chronological prophecies (a matter in which each reader must judge for himself according to his general views), in the same measure it is probable that we can determine the bisection, the commencement of the second 1260 years, and the termination of the whole series.

"I ask then, is the year of the rise of the Babylonian Empire known with any degree of certainty, and, above all, is it a year in any way noted in the historical or prophetic Scriptures themselves as an era of great and world-wide revolution and change? For it seems to be probable that if the 'year-day' theory be divinely true, the point of departure in the secular prophecies would be noted in the Word of God as well as on the page of history.

"Now, the year of the destruction of Nineveh, and with it of the old Assyrian Empire, conforms to these conditions. It is the year B.C. 626. In that year, beyond any doubt, as may be seen in the most recent works of Mr. Layard and of the Rev. George Rawlinson, the Assyrian Empire fell by the conflagration of its capital and the slaughter of its rulers. The agent of these awful judgments of Heaven was Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, and the first emperor of

independent Babylon. From having been a satrap of the Assyrian Empire he became its conqueror, and made Babylon the capital of a new sovereignty.

"This great year, 626 B.C., which is known to have been the year of the rise of the Babylonian kingdom, both from historical and monumental evidence, is the same year in which Jeremiah was called to the prophetic office, with a speciality in his vocation as 'prophet of the kingdoms.' It was 'the thirteenth year of Josiah,' as may be seen by consulting any corrected table of the kings of Judah. 'The word of the Lord came to him,' he says in his first chapter, 'in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, son of Amon'; and these are the words of his great commission, 'See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, and to build, and to plant,' Jeremiah i. 10. It would seem, therefore, that Jeremiah was appointed to his office in the very year which saw the great revolution involved in the downfall of the Assyrian Empire, through the rise of the Babylonian power. Those who will read his 25th chapter will see how extended were to be the political results of that revolution.

"The same year, B C. 626, was the fortieth year before the destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem by the Babylonians; thus forming apparently the first year of Ezekiel's forty years' prophetic 'siege' of the holy city.

"The year B.C. 626 is thus marked, both in history and Scripture, as an era of remarkable importance.

"Now, if we reckon from this year 'seven times' of years (seven times three hundred and sixty years) or 2520 years, we reach, not 1866, but 1894; and the point of bisection, and consequent commencement of the second 'three times and a half,' or 1260 years, is A.D. 634–35. This was the era of the conquest of Jerusalem by Omar and the Saracens—a consummation marked by the exclamation of the Christian patriarch

of Jerusalem, as Gibbon relates, 'Now the abomination stands in the holy place!'

"I must now note one or two 'curious coincidences,' which will, I hope, experience some toleration, at least from those who have discovered so many others pointing to 1866 as the year of destiny.

"1. The carrying captive of Judah, and the commencement of the seventy years' migration to Babylon, was in the year B.C. 606, twenty years later than the era which I conjecture to be the starting-point of the 'seven times.' Now, from the year B.C. 606 to 1894 is exactly *Fifty Jubilees*. There are those who will see nothing but that which is accidental in this coincidence; there are others who will be inclined to think that the termination of such a jubilee of jubilees will witness the end of the 'scattering of the power of the holy people' and their 'return to their inheritance.'

"2. Daniel adds seventy-five 'days' to the end of the 1260 during which God's enemies triumph, making '1335 days.' He adds, 'Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thirteen hundred and thirty-five days.' Is it possible that these seventy-five years form a period of reconstruction of political power, both Jewish and Gentile, and of revelation, answerable to the seventy-five years that elapsed from the birth of John the Baptist to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans? Be this as it may, let me direct attention to the circumstance that if we add seventy-five years to 1894, the conjectured end of the 'seven times,' we reach A.D. 1969.

"The coincidence to which I refer is one that relates to this year 1969, and is derived from the study of the vision of the ram and the he-goat in the eighth chapter of Daniel. There has been great controversy respecting the true meaning of the 'little horn' in this chapter. I shall assume that its meaning was germinant, and was not exhausted in the history of Antiochus. The vision commences by representing the de-

struction of the Persian Empire by the Macedonian power, and it is for many 'days.' Its views extend over a period described as '2300 mornings or evenings.' I shall again, without discussion, assume the application of the year-day theory to this number. The year in which the 'great horn,' representing the 'first king' of the 'he-goat' empire (Alexander the Great) 'Smote the ram,' conquered Darius in the battle of Arbela, and burnt Persepolis, was B.C. 331.

"If you reckon 2300 years from this year, B.C. 331, you reach A.D. 1969, the same year which is obtained by a wholly different series of calculations, founded on the seven times, and the addition of seventy-five years to their sum, according to the suggestion in the last chapter of Daniel. I may add that Daniel declares that the 'cleansing of the sanctuary' will then occur; and it is synchronous with the time of 'blessedness' mentioned as following the '1335 days.'

"Let us end these assumptions (at which I know many able and worthy persons will smile serene derision) by saying that, 'if' these conjectural interpretations of chronological prophecy are correct, 'Babylon' will not fall in 1866, nor until 1894; and that then will occur also the return of the Jews ('if' they are to return to Palestine), and the beginning of the European 'end,' the centenary and frightful democratic completion of the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution. And up till that period we may expect no great crisis in European affairs, no permanent downfall of the Popedom (which has had many falls and many resurrections), no victory of either faith or infidelity, but only the 'growth' of all things, good and bad, 'until the harvest,' when the witnesses for truth and right will undergo a temporary defeat from the same victorious 'Beast' who will make 'Babylon' desolate, to be succeeded by a final and enduring triumph of righteousness on earth. I am not at all certain that my 'predictions' are correct, but I submit them to your readers as, perhaps, deserving of a little attention

at the present time. If the year passes without unfolding any remarkable passages in the page of history perhaps these suggestions may acquire progressive value in the years that follow.

"EDWARD WHITE.

"*February* 12, 1866."

## PROPHECIES ABOUT THEIR DISPERSION AND CONTINUED EXISTENCE.

By MOSES (Neh. i., 8).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dispersion and desolation of country | Lev. | xxvi. | 33 |
| Yet not cast away | ,, | xxvi. | 44, 45 |
| (Not to be reckoned among the nations) | Num. | xxiii. | 9 |
| Scattered among the nations | Deut. | iv. | 27 |
| Into all the kingdoms of the earth | ,, | xxviii. | 25 |
| Smitten with blindness | ,, | xxviii. | 28 |
| To be oppressed and spoiled | ,, | xxviii. | 29 |
| Objects of scorn and contempt | ,, | xxviii. | 37 |
| The siege of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) | ,, | xxviii. | 49–57 |
| Scattered from one end of the earth even unto the other | ,, | xxviii. | 64 |
| Wandering and restless state | ,, | xxviii. | 65 |

BY THE PROPHETS.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cities wasted without inhabitant | Isa. | vi. | 11 |
| Universal dispersion | Jer. | ix. 16 | xv. 4 |
| A reproach, a proverb, a taunt, and a curse | ,, | xxiv. | 9 |
| Persecution, &c. | ,, | xxix. | 18 |
| Punished but not destroyed | ,, | xlvi. | 27, 28 |
| Dispersion | Ezek. | v, 10 | xii–15 |
| Without royal or religious privileges | Hos. | iii. | 4 |
| Wanderers among the nations | ,, | ix. | 17 |
| Sifted among all nations, but preserved | Amos | ix. | 9 |
| Not consumed | Mal. | iii. | 6 |

struction of the Persian Empire by the Macedonian power, and it is for many 'days.' Its views extend over a period described as '2300 mornings or evenings.' I shall again, without discussion, assume the application of the year-day theory to this number. The year in which the 'great horn,' representing the 'first king' of the 'he-goat' empire (Alexander the Great) 'Smote the ram,' conquered Darius in the battle of Arbela, and burnt Persepolis, was B.C. 331.

"If you reckon 2300 years from this year, B.C. 331, you reach A.D. 1969, the same year which is obtained by a wholly different series of calculations, founded on the seven times, and the addition of seventy-five years to their sum, according to the suggestion in the last chapter of Daniel. I may add that Daniel declares that the 'cleansing of the sanctuary' will then occur; and it is synchronous with the time of 'blessedness' mentioned as following the '1335 days.'

"Let us end these assumptions (at which I know many able and worthy persons will smile serene derision) by saying that, 'if' these conjectural interpretations of chronological prophecy are correct, 'Babylon' will not fall in 1866, nor until 1894; and that then will occur also the return of the Jews ('if' they are to return to Palestine), and the beginning of the European 'end,' the centenary and frightful democratic completion of the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution. And up till that period we may expect no great crisis in European affairs, no permanent downfall of the Por[illegible] which h[illegible] falls and many resurrections [illegible] of infidelity, but only the 'gro[illegible] 'until the harvest,' when [illegible] undergo a temporary de[illegible] who will make 'Baby[illegible] and enduring triu[illegible] all certain that [illegible] them to your r[illegible]

at the present time. If the year passes without unfolding any remarkable passages in the page of history perhaps these suggestions may acquire progressive value in the years that follow.

"EDWARD WHITE.

"*February* 12, 1866."

## PROPHECIES ABOUT THEIR DISPERSION AND CONTINUED EXISTENCE.

### By Moses (Neh. i., 8).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dispersion and desolation of country | Lev. | xxvi. | 33 |
| Yet not cast away | „ | xxvi. | 44, 45 |
| (Not to be reckoned among the nations) | Num. | xxiii. | 9 |
| Scattered among the nations | Deut. | iv. | 27 |
| Into all the kingdoms of the earth | „ | xxviii. | 25 |
| Smitten with blindness | „ | xxviii. | 28 |
| To be oppressed and spoiled | „ | xxviii. | 29 |
| Objects of scorn and contempt | „ | xxviii. | 37 |
| The siege of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) | „ | xxviii. | 49–57 |
| Scattered from one end of the earth even unto the other | „ | xxviii. | 64 |
| Wandering and restless state | „ | xxviii. | 65 |

### By the Prophets.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cities wasted without inhabitant | Isa. | vi. | 11 |
| Universal dispersion | Jer. | ix. 16 | xv. 4 |
| [illegible]h, a proverb, [illegible]nd a | „ | xxiv. | 9 |
| [illegible] &c. | „ | xxix. | 18 |
| [illegible] not destr[illegible] | „ | xlvi. | 27, 28 |
| [illegible] | Ezek. | v, 10 | xii–15 |
| [illegible] religio[illegible] | Hos. | iii. | 4 |
| [illegible] the [illegible] | „ | ix. | 17 |
| [illegible]ion [illegible]d | Amos | ix. | 9 |
| [illegible] | Mal. | iii. | 6 |

### By our Lord.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Their vineyard let out to others . . | Mat. | xxi. | 41 |
| Desolation . . . . . | „ | xxiii. | 38 |
| The city to be razed . . . . | Luke | xix. | 44 |
| Led captive into all nations, Jerusalem trodden down, *until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled . . . . | „ | xxi. | 24 |

### Restoration to their own Land.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prayer: Turn again our captivity, O Lord | Ps. | cxxvi. | 4 |
| Promise: I shall bring again their captivity | Jer. | xxxi. | 23 |
| | Zeph. | iii. | 20 |
| Rejoicings at restoration . . . . | Ps. | liii. | 6 |
| | „ | cxxvi. | 1 |
| "Every man to his land," . . . | Jer. | xii. | 15 |
| I will assemble all of thee . . . | Micah | ii. | 12 |
| Again, the "second" time . . . | Isa. | xi. | 11, 12 |
| | Amos | ix. | 14 |
| Tabernacle of David to be rebuilt . . | Acts | xv. | 16 |
| | Amos | ix. | 11 |
| To inherit the land for ever . . . | Isa. | lx. | 21 |
| To be no more pulled up out . . . | Amos | ix. | 15 |
| A delightsome land . . . . . | Mal. | iii. | 12 |
| *Cf.* | Dan. | viii. | 9 |
| Judges of the restored tribes . . . | Matt. | xix. | 28 |
| | Luke | xxii. | 29, 30 |

### Other Prophecies.

Lev. xxvi. 40–45; Deut. xxx. 1–5; Isa. xiv. 1; lviii. 12; xi. 21; Jer. iii. 16–18; xvi. 14–15; xxiii. 3, 5–8; xxx. 3, 18;

* Some of these Prophecies were fulfilled at the first Restoration, B.C. 536; but, as that was only partial and temporary, and the Jews are again in dispersion, these passages probably await a complete and lasting fulfilment.

xxxi. 10–14; xxxii. 37–44; xxxiii. 7, 10, 11; xlvi. 27, 28; Ezek. xi. 17; xvi. 53; xx. 34, 42; xxviii. 25, 26; xxxiv. 13; xxxvi. 34; xxxvii; Joel iii. l. 20; Zach. i. 17.

### THEIR FUTURE NATIONAL CONVERSION.

"IN HIS DAYS" (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The receiving of them | Rom. | xi. | 15 |
| All Israel shall be saved | „ | xi. | 26 |
| | Isa. | lix. | 20, 21 |
| They shall look upon Him | Zech. | xii. | 10 |
| | Rev. | i. | 7 |
| Comforted and redeemed | Isa. | lii. | 9 |
| A cleansed nation | Jer. | xxxiii. | 8 |
| | Ezek. | xxxvi | 24–28 |
| Pardoned | Micah | vii. | 19–20 |
| All righteous | Isa. | lx. | 21 |
| A new spirit within them | Ezek. | xi. | 19 |
| God is with them | Zech. | viii. | 8 |
| The new covenant | Jer. | xxxi. | 31–34 |
| | „ | xxxii. | 37–40 |
| | Ezek. | xvi. | 60 |
| | Heb. | viii. | 7–13 |
| Saved from their enemies | Luke | i. | 71, 74, 75 |
| The kingdom to come to | Acts | i. | 6 |
| | Micah | iv. | 8 |
| Their welcome to their King | Luke | xiii. | 35 |
| | Isa. | xxv. | 9 |
| They shall fear Him | Hos. | iii. | 5 |
| He shall reign over them for ever | Micah | iv. | 7 |
| He shall reign before His ancients gloriously | Isa. | xxiv. | 23 |
| No end to this Kingdom | Luke | i. | 32–33 |
| | Isa. | ix. | 6–7 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The glory of His people Israel . . . | Luke | ii. | 32 |
| | Isa. | lxii. | 2 |
| | Zach. | xiv. | 9 |
| All nations call them blessed . . . | Mal. | iii. | 12 |
| | Isa. | lxi. | 9 |
| | Zeph. | iii. | 19 |
| Gentiles rejoice with them . . . | Rom. | xv. | 10 |
| Symbolical number of the redeemed nation | Rev. | vii. | 4–8 |
| Times of refreshing and restitution . . | Acts | iii. | 19–21 |

JEWS TO BE A BLESSING TO THE WORLD.

(Deut. xxxiii. 29.)

Gen. xii., 3; xviii., 18; xxii., 18; xxvi., 4; xxviii., 14; Acts iii. 25; Gal. iii., 7-9, 16.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ye shall be a blessing . . . . . | Isa. | xix. | 24 |
| | Zech. | viii. | 13 |
| Shall fill the face of the world with fruit . | Isa. | xxvii. | 6 |
| As dew from the Lord . . . . . | Micah | v. | 7 |
| Ministers of our God . . . . . | Isa. | lxi. | 6 |
| Shall declare His glory to the Gentiles . | ,, | lxvi. | 19 |
| All flesh shall worship before Him . . | ,, | lxvi. | 23 |
| We will go with you . . . . . | Zech. | viii. | 23 |
| Life from the dead . . . . . | Rom. | xi. | 15* |

ST. PETERSBURG, *June 27th*, 1891.

DEAR BARON DE HIRSCH,

I arrived yesterday back in St. Petersburg after a tour of inspection and investigation, the object of which was to study the capacity of the Russian Jew for agriculture and colonisation, and, incidentally, to see with my own eyes what

* Missions to Jews: Rev. W. T. Gidney, M.A.

the effect has been on the Jewish population of the recent events.

In pursuing these studies I have visited the following places:

| | |
|---|---|
| Moscow | Kieff |
| Varoshba | Berdicheff |
| Baromla | Odessa |
| Bolrovo | Kherson |

The Agricultural Colonies of

| | |
|---|---|
| Dolraye | Kremenschug |
| Yeffingar | Homel |
| Novaia Poltavka | Minsk |
| Nicolaieff | Wilna |
| Ekaterinoslaw | |

I had great advantages in my journey. M. Pobedonosteff gave me an autograph letter describing my mission and your objects, and the Minister of the Interior wrote to all the governors. You will see from this that I enjoyed exceptional advantages in learning the official view of the case. I must say that, although I found the higher officials very frank and courteous, they—with a few exceptions—took their colour from St. Petersburg, and I attach, therefore, more importance to the views of tchinovniks not so highly placed as to come under the direct influence of the capital. These latter almost invariably spoke the whole truth. The others told part of the truth—which, after all, is what one expects from a witness personally interested in a case.

The Jews also gave me the best credentials, and everywhere I went I met the most respectable Jews, and I also tried to see the worst and poorest. By this means I not only sifted the Government evidence in the Israelite sieve, but also was able to weigh the value of the Hebrew evidence in the Government scales. I examined over two hundred witnesses, whose testi-

mony, together with my own careful observations, lead me to the following conclusions. I think it better to give you at once a rough *précis* of the views I have formed than to let you wait for an elaborate report. During the journey I was accompanied by a Russian-Jewish gentleman named Feinberg, who speaks the "jargon"—half Hebrew and half German—of the Chosen People, and to whose loyal help and ever ready energy I am deeply indebted. I quite expected that he would often be insulted, but this only occurred once, at Kieff, where he was ordered to quit the hotel on the ground of his religion. I am bound to say that even on that occasion a visit to the Governor soon put matters right.

Assuming two things—(1st) That the Jewish population of Russia amounts to 5,000,000; and (2nd) that the Jews I *have* seen are a fair sample of the Jews I have *not* seen. I do not consider more than 20 per cent. of the adult males, *at the present time*, to be physically fit to bear the strain inseparable from settlement in a new country, under strange conditions, and with physical hardships to endure. As a whole, the sedentary Jews are physically inferior to the sedentary Russians. Indeed, I can remember no country in Europe the town population of which does not excel, in physique, the poor Russian Jew townsmen. When, however, I contrast the Jew townsmen with the Jews settled by the Emperor Nicholas in the Government of Kherson, the difference is amazing. I found them an active, well set-up, sunburnt, muscular agricultural population, marked by all the characteristics of a peasantry of the highest character. There are 30,000 of these people. So far as I could learn from the neighbouring proprietors—Russians who employed them—they have no vice, unless early, improvident, and fruitful marriages can be deemed a vice.

Besides these agriculturists, there is a population of 300,000 able-bodied men who are engaged in arduous manual labour in or about the towns. As instances of this class I may cite

the 10,000 labourers and artisans of Berdicheff, the wharf labourers of Odessa, the corn porters of Nicolaieff, and the agricultural labourers of Kremenschug, of whom at least 4000 are hired out at harvest time by neighbouring proprietors. All these men are fit for colonisation, though all are not equally fit.

But as a set-off against the physical inferiority to which reference has been made, two elements must be taken into consideration in any analysis of the worth of the Jew as a colonist, and which, in my opinion, more than compensate for his poverty in muscle. The first of these elements is the highly nervous temperament of the average Jew, which is not only the source of all the accusations of cowardice brought against him, but at the same time gives him an astounding capacity to sustain exertion for lengthy periods of time impossible to the stolid beer-drinking Englishman, or equally self-indulgent Russ. This quality of "last" is an atonement Nature has made to the Jew for denying him a coarser fibre and a larger build.

The second element in the problem is a factor the value of which can only be assessed by those who have actually undergone the heart-breaking task of planting poor unemployed Englishmen on unemployed colonial acres. I refer to the high moral tone of the average Jew. With one exception (Admiral Selenen, Governor of Odessa), the whole of my evidence points to the fact that the Jew is habitually temperate; he rarely drinks alcohol, rarely smokes; he is a good husband, father, son; he is not addicted to the use of filthy or blasphemous language; he is patient in trouble, and is most industrious in his work. Faults he undoubtedly has, but they are not of a nature that enter seriously into the question of colonisation, provided the dilemma of "work or die" is sternly presented to him, and provided he is not surrounded by a well-to-do population of an alien faith and of another race.

Of the typical Jew, as I so often heard him described in

St. Petersburg—a compound of thief, usurer, and pimp, I have not met an instance—of course many such men must exist or how could the fiction have been floated? M. Pobedonosteff said to me in one of our conversations: "The Jew is a parasite —remove him from the living organism in which, and on which, he exists, and put this parasite on a rock, and he will die." The fact is M. Pobedonosteff has created for himself a Frankenstein of a Jew in his own imagination. He has been very civil and kind to me, and I certainly shall never abuse him behind his back, but he really does not know what he is talking about when he calls the Jew a helpless parasite. I shall tell him this to his face, if I have a chance, for it is better to do this than to retire to a safe distance, and there to institute invidious comparisons between M. Pobedonosteff and Caligula. The fact is, that in Russia the Jew has been forced into commerce, and, being clever, has made a success of the only callings available to him. The only thing to moralise him and to make him like other people is to restore him to the land. That he can be moralised by sunshine and sweat is shown by the conspicuous success of the Emperor Nicholas' colonies, of which I cannot speak too highly.

So far as my obversations go, the Russian Jew and his children have not enough to eat. Until I see what good nourishing food will do for him, it is impossible to say what proportion of the adult male population will eventually be capable of outdoor work. At present, dejection clouds the life of the whole Jewish population. But their misery is not, as yet, the parent of crime on a large scale. The pressure of existence, the uncertainty of the future, and the actual want of tens of thousands under the present state of affairs, is an excellent criterion by which to judge the bearing and character of the Jews when under the stress of strain and struggle that will be incident to the early years of your colonising scheme, in common with every other since the history of the world began.

In short, if courage — moral courage — hope, patience, temperance, are fine qualities, then the Jews are a fine people. Such a people, under wise direction, is destined to make a success of any well-organised plan of colonisation, whether in Argentina, Siberia, or South Africa.

But the difficulties in the way are many, and I do not think that you will effectually grapple with them unless the public and cordial assistance of the Russian Government is given. Your first detachment must be a *corps d'élite*, for unless you make a success of the first detachment, future success is improbable. Nothing must be left to chance. I should advise your taking your first detachment from the agricultural colonies of the Emperor Nicholas, where the families have not only outgrown the capacity of the land to support them, but where the Government has withdrawn ten dessiatines from each cultivator. There is distress even there. The following four points, on which the assistance of the Russian Government is of the first importance, I recommend to your notice:

1. In order to organise the emigrant parties, you must positively have local advice. In other words, there must be Emigration Committees composed of the most worthy and respected Jews in each town. Their duties would be:

a. To choose emigrants.

b. To disburse funds.

c. To control and arrange the departure of parties.

d. To communicate with Government on behalf of emigrants.

e. To form a centre of communication between you, the Government, and the emigrants.

A head committee will be required in St. Petersburg, to control the subordinate committees.

Under the present laws the Jews must either organise their emigration in secret or not at all, and unless the Government gives its consent to the formation of these committees, I do

not see how you can organise your scheme with any success. Of course the Government will probably want to be represented on these committees, and this is only right, in order that the permission given is loyally used, and not turned to purposes which would not be allowed or contemplated by the Government.

It is obvious that only Jews of the highest character and good position should be appointed to these committees.

2. The present passport system is most impossible. A door must be open or shut. So therefore it is necessary to modify the costly and onerous passport system, and replace it by some system of gratuitous certificates of emigration, which shall carry with them the renunciation of rights, and the exemption from duties as Russian citizens, after the frontier is crossed. No extra burden of military or other service ought to be imposed on the Jews who remain in consequence of the emigrant Jews quitting the country. In other words, open the Russian door under conditions that shall for ever disembarrass the Russian Goverment of the Jews who avail of your scheme.

3. I think the Russian Government might give gratuitous transport to all poor holders of emigration certificates. It would not cost them much, and would give a very good impression in Europe.

4. Your scheme will take years to work out, therefore we must look ahead. The young Jews ought to be trained in manual labour and in agriculture. Nihilism comes from empty stomachs and University training. Make the young people work with their hands, and thus prepare them for the future life in the colony, and you will make a new and valuable state. Therefore, I think you should ask for permission to start agricultural schools, where handicrafts will be taught. If this is not done, you will have a very ignorant population to deal with after you have started your *corps d'élite.*

This, briefly, dear Baron, is what I have to say, though there

is an enormous mass of detail to communicate. But I cannot conclude this brief report without a word on the suffering of the children, to which I have been a witness. I saw the India famine of 1878; and I have seen much trouble and sadness in different parts of the world. But nothing has ever touched my heart like the suffering of these Jewish children. They are not yet thieves, usurers, exploiters, pimps, malingerers, or parasites. They are inarticulate. They cannot plead their own case. Life is hard for them, and they wonder why it is hard. It grows harder every day. From all I can learn, I do believe that if the suffering of these innocent Jewish babies were known to the Emperor, he would at least grant us permission to organise openly, and at leisure, measures for the relief of these children and their parents. For the burden that is laid upon them is more than they can bear.

I am, dear BARON DE HIRSCH,

Yours very truly,

ARNOLD WHITE.

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
London & Edinburgh

M

N

M